United Nations A/59/385

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 September 2004

Original: English

Fifty-ninth session
Agenda item 105 (b)
Human rights questions: human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms

The right to food

Note by the Secretary-General*

The Secretary-General has the honour to transmit to the General Assembly the interim report of the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on the right to food, Jean Ziegler, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 58/186.

* The present report was submitted after the deadline provided for in the relevant General Assembly resolutions owing to the need for additional consultations with specialized agencies to reflect the most up-to-date information available.

04-52517 (E) 201004

Summary

The Special Rapporteur on the right to food hereby submits his fourth report to the General Assembly as requested by its resolution 58/186 and Commission on Human Rights resolution 2004/19.

The report opens with an overview of the current situation of world hunger, reviews the activities of the Special Rapporteur over the last year, and then addresses situations of special concern with regard to the right to food.

The shocking news is that hunger is increasing. According to the most recent report of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the number of victims of permanent and grave undernourishment has increased since its last report. There are now 842 million people suffering from undernourishment in a world that already grows more than enough food to feed the global population. Hunger levels have increased every year since the World Food Summit in 1996, when Governments promised to cut hunger. Hunger kills many more people than any contemporary war or terrorist attack. One child below the age of 5 dies from hunger-related diseases every five seconds. It is an outrage that we let hunger kill so many small children. The right to food is a human right, inherent in every human being.

The Special Rapporteur is gravely concerned at current situations in a number of countries and areas, particularly in the Sudan, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Cuba and the Occupied Palestinian Territories. He urges the Governments of the Sudan and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take immediate action to stop violations of the right to food of their peoples. He also urges the Government of Israel, as the occupying Power, to respect its obligations under international human rights and humanitarian law towards the right to food of people living in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. He also urges the Government of the United States of America to refrain from unilateral measures that affect the right to food of people living in Cuba.

In order to enforce the right to food, it is essential that the general understanding of the right is better developed. At present, the FAO Intergovernmental Working Group is involved in drafting "voluntary guidelines" that aim to assist Governments in their efforts to implement the right to food through a rights-based approach to food security. The report gives an update on this process, but observes that these draft guidelines may remain relatively weak, because a small number of Governments are reluctant to strengthen the protection of the right to food. The Special Rapporteur urges Governments to focus on the goal of the right to food for all and to strengthen the final guidelines.

In the last chapter, the report examines a newly emerging issue that is important for the right to food. In many countries, especially in Asia, but also in Africa and Latin America, many communities are dependent on fish and fishery resources for their access to food and their livelihoods. However, the ongoing restructuring of the fish trade and the fishing industry sometimes has negative effects on the livelihoods and food security of artisanal and subsistence fishers, leaving many behind in the drive towards industrialization, privatization and export orientation. Care must be taken to ensure that changes in policies and programmes do not result in the effective exclusion of artisanal and subsistence fishers from their access to fishing grounds. It should be ensured that shifts towards industrialization, privatization and export

orientation of the fishing industry do not result in the transfer of the rights and resources of the poor into the hands of the rich. The right to food means primarily the right to be able to feed oneself with dignity, and therefore requires, inter alia, taking positive action to protect adequate livelihoods, particularly where there are few alternatives. The right to food requires that this right be respected, protected and fulfilled for all people, including marginalized fishing communities.

The report ends with a series of recommendations.

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Introduction	1–15	4
II.	Situations of special concern	16–24	7
III.	An update on the "voluntary guidelines" on the right to adequate food	25–32	10
IV.	The right to adequate food and fishing livelihoods	33–60	12
V.	Conclusions and recommendations	61–62	20

I. Introduction

1. The Special Rapporteur hereby submits his fourth report to the General Assembly, as requested by the General Assembly in resolution 58/186 and the Commission on Human Rights in resolution 2004/19.

2. It is an outrage that in the twenty-first century one child under the age of 5 will die every five seconds from hunger-related diseases.[1] That means that more than 6 million tiny children will be killed by hunger by the end of 2004. Hunger will kill more people than all wars fought this year. Yet where is the fight against hunger? In its latest report, *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2003*, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) reports a "setback in the war against hunger". The number of permanently and gravely undernourished people has increased to 842 million people from 840 million in its last report. Despite progress made in the early 1990s, the number of victims of chronic undernourishment increased by 18 million between 1995-1997 and 1999-2001. Although important recent progress has been made in 19 countries, the overall trend is now one of regression, rather than the progressive realization of the right to food. A number of highly populated countries have slipped into reverse, including India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan and the Sudan. Progress in China is slowing. The FAO report warns that "prospects for reaching the World Food Summit goal of halving the number of hungry people by 2015 appear increasingly remote". Hunger has increased, rather than decreased since 1996. This makes a mockery of the promises made by Governments at the World Food Summits held in 1996 and 2002, as well as the promises contained in the Millennium Development Goals.

3. Hunger is not inevitable. Nor is it acceptable. We live in a world that is richer than ever before and that is entirely capable of eradicating hunger. There is no secret as to how to eradicate hunger, there is no need for new technologies, there is simply the need for political commitment to challenge existing policies that make the rich richer and the poor poorer. It is time to fully recognize the right to food as a human right that deserves to be fully enforced, as much as any other human right. It is unacceptable that the right to freedom from hunger and the right to adequate food should be considered as simply "aspirations" rather than real human rights that Governments are obliged to respect and to enforce.

4. The right to food is a human right, protected under international human rights and humanitarian law. It has been authoritatively defined in general comment No. 12 of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as follows: "The right to adequate food is realized when every man, woman and child, alone or in community with others, has physical and economic access at all times to adequate food or means for its procurement" (para. 6). The Special Rapporteur, inspired by the general comment, summarizes the definition of the right to food as:

> The right to food is the right to have regular, permanent and unrestricted access, either directly or by means of financial purchases, to quantitatively and qualitatively adequate and sufficient food corresponding to the cultural traditions of the people to which the consumer belongs, and which ensures a physical and mental, individual and collective, fulfilling and dignified life free of fear (E/CN.4/2001/53, para. 14).

5. The right to food means that Governments bear obligations towards their people. These are the obligations to respect, protect and fulfil the right to food. The

obligation to respect the right to food means that Governments must not take actions that negatively affect people's existing access to food. This means that Governments should not, for example, forcibly displace people from their land or farms, or arbitrarily destroy their crops or food, use food as a political weapon or restrict access to humanitarian food aid. The obligation to protect means that Governments must protect people from the possible negative actions of other powerful actors and implies that Governments must adopt appropriate regulation — for example, to prevent the poisoning of water supplies, to prevent non-access to water after, for example, a process of water privatization or to otherwise protect people against abuses of corporate power. Finally, the obligation to fulfil means that Governments must do everything in their power to create an enabling environment to ensure that all people can feed themselves in dignity. The right to food is primarily about the right to be able to feed oneself in dignity. Governments have a responsibility to ensure that all, including the poorest and most discriminated against, have an adequate livelihood to sustain their food security. As a last resort, Governments must provide social safety nets or other forms of support to people who cannot, for reasons beyond their own control, feed themselves. This support should be provided as a matter of right, rather than charity, in order to ensure human dignity. As FAO has outlined, "a rights-based approach to food security emphasizes the satisfaction of people's basic needs as a matter of right, rather than of benevolence".[2]

6. The Special Rapporteur is aware that a number of Governments have an aversion to the very concept of the right to adequate food or its justiciability — some because they believe that it is not compatible with their juridical or political systems, and others because they believe that it is not compatible with a market-based economy. However, the Special Rapporteur would point out that the human right to adequate food simply tries to guarantee freedom from hunger and access to food for every human being at all times. It is unacceptable to let people die from starvation anywhere in the world today. All human beings have the right to live in dignity, free from hunger.

Recent activities of the Special Rapporteur

7. The work of the Special Rapporteur to fight for the right to food and fulfil his mandate has included many activities over the last year. The Special Rapporteur submitted his report to the Commission on Human Rights at its sixtieth session in April 2004, which highlighted issues related to food sovereignty and transnational corporations in relation to the right to food as well as reports of his missions to Bangladesh and the Occupied Palestinian Territories (E/CN.4/2004/10 and Add.1 and 2). This year he has so far carried out country missions to Ethiopia (February 2004) and to Mongolia (August 2004) to analyse and catalyse efforts towards the realization of the right to adequate food. He is planning to carry out missions in the near future to Guatemala, India and South Africa to analyse the situation of the right to food and learn from positive examples of fighting hunger in these countries.

8. The Special Rapporteur has also made requests to undertake country missions to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Myanmar, but has received no response from these Governments.

9. The Special Rapporteur has also continued to issue urgent appeals and press statements, individually and jointly with other special rapporteurs, in urgent situations related to the right to adequate food in the Occupied Palestinian

Territories, Romania, the Sudan and Zimbabwe. The Special Rapporteur has also written to Governments seeking information on alleged violations of the right to adequate food, including regarding particular cases in India, Myanmar and the Philippines. Replies from the Governments concerned, except for the Governments of India and Romania, were still awaited at the time of submitting this report. The Special Rapporteur is also grateful for the information he received in reply to his letter addressed to the President of the European Commission, forwarding the above-mentioned report of his mission to the Occupied Palestinian Territories.

10. As well as monitoring situations of concern and violations of the right to food, the Special Rapporteur has followed positive developments with respect to the right to food. He is continuing to follow positive initiatives being taken in Sierra Leone, Brazil, India and South Africa and is also following new developments in Honduras and Uganda. He commends the non-governmental organizations' initiative to establish national special rapporteurs in Brazil and remains in close contact with the national special rapporteur on the right to food. He recommends that other countries study this experience with a view to establishing similar mechanisms to monitor the realization of the right to adequate food. There are also a number of other important developments in Brazil, which include the Government's initiative to re-establish the National Food and Nutritional Security Council (CONSEA) and the proposal to create a framework law to promote the right to food, as well as mechanisms for monitoring violations of the right to food. An international seminar will be held in Brazil in December 2004 to discuss the National Framework Law on the right to food, which will significantly advance this process.

11. The Special Rapporteur and his team have also participated in many international meetings with governmental, non-governmental and United Nations organizations, in order to raise awareness of the right to adequate food, and have been impressed by the growing commitment by many organizations towards a better understanding and implementation of the right to adequate food. In working with the United Nations agencies to promote the right to food, the Special Rapporteur welcomed the invitation of the Executive Director of the World Food Programme (WFP) to participate in the WFP Global Meeting, held in Dublin from 7 to 10 June 2004. This important meeting, held once every four years, brought together all heads of WFP offices to discuss strategies for strengthening their fight against famine. The Special Rapporteur participated in a panel with George McGovern and had the opportunity to make a presentation on the progress being made on the issue of the right to food within the United Nations system and among Member States. The Special Rapporteur is deeply impressed by the work of WFP and looks forward to collaborating further with WFP on the right to food.

12. The Special Rapporteur also made a presentation at the international symposium on "Peace, justice and international law" organized by the Fondación Sistema and the Government of Spain in Salamanca from 23 to 26 June 2004. The symposium was attended by leading figures from the Government of Spain and many permanent representatives to the United Nations.

13. His team also contributed to the international meeting on the "Right to food and access to justice", held in May 2004 at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland, under the auspices of the Jacques Maritain Institute and financed by the Governments of Switzerland, Germany and Norway. The seminar examined many cases demonstrating the justiciability of the right to adequate food and other

economic, social and cultural rights across the world, and was aimed at contributing to the work of the FAO Intergovernmental Working Group in developing voluntary guidelines on the right to food.

14. Also in May 2004, the Special Rapporteur and his team participated in meetings with a new initiative, GAIN — the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition — which aims to promote ethical and responsible food fortification as one way to eliminate vitamin and mineral deficiencies around the world. GAIN is currently developing the "Blueprint for responsible production and marketing of fortified foods", which will set out the basic guiding ethical principles for its public and private civil society partnerships. The Special Rapporteur was encouraged that GAIN is committed to human rights and social justice. He advocated that GAIN should focus on helping the poorest, especially through fortifying basic staple foods, and suggested that GAIN's Blueprint adopt an explicit recognition of the right to food (as outlined in general comment No. 12) and the human rights principles of dignity, non-discrimination, participation, accountability and transparency. He believes that the GAIN initiative will be important in the fight against micronutrient malnutrition, if it focuses on the poorest. Although food fortification is not a panacea for improving nutrition, since it does not challenge the political and economic exclusions that often lead to malnutrition amongst the poor, it can still make a vital difference to improving people's lives.

15. Efforts have also included meetings with numerous civil society organizations, including those working on specific campaigns on the right to food in India, Spain, France and Germany. The Special Rapporteur and his team have collaborated with Action contre la faim (ACF), including contributing to its publication *Geopolitics of Hunger*. He has also worked with a new international campaign on the right to food established in Spain, which links Spanish NGOs to lobby for the realization of the right to food in Spain and across the world.[3] He also continues to work with the non-governmental organization FIAN in its extremely important work in highlighting violations of the right to food and raising awareness of this right.[4]

II. Situations of special concern

16. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur includes monitoring violations of the right to adequate food and situations of special concern. At the time of writing this report, the Special Rapporteur is particularly concerned about the situation of the right to food in the following countries and areas.

Darfur region, Sudan

17. The Special Rapporteur is gravely concerned at reports of violations of the right to food amidst ethnic cleansing and widespread killings, rapes and other human rights abuses occurring in the Darfur region of western Sudan. He issued a joint statement on the issue with seven other special rapporteurs on 29 March 2004. In just over a year, more than 110,000 Sudanese have fled across the border into neighbouring Chad and over 750,000 have become internally displaced within the Sudan as a result of conflict in Darfur between the national Government, allied militias and rebel groups. It is reported that militia groups, including the Janjaweed, the Muraheleen and the Popular Defence Forces, with alleged links to the

Government of the Sudan, are trying to forcibly remove the non-Arab segment of the local population.

18. Militias have violated the obligation to respect the right to food by destroying, damaging or looting crops, agricultural areas, livestock and drinking water installations, including severe destruction of resources in western Darfur's Jabal Marrah area, as well as forcibly displacing up to a million people from their homes. The destruction of resources essential to survival and forced displacement are prohibited under international human rights and humanitarian law and amount to a violation of the right to food, particularly when people are displaced from their means of subsistence. This has left millions of people dependent on humanitarian support for their survival, yet militias have sometimes made the access of humanitarian organizations to these regions extremely difficult. Restricting access for humanitarian organizations seeking to provide urgent aid of food and water also amounts to a violation of the obligation to fulfil the right to food under international human rights and humanitarian law. The Special Rapporteur has expressed particular concern that the Government of the Sudan is urging Darfur's massive internally displaced population to return to their homes when safety is still not assured and their livelihoods have been destroyed. The Special Rapporteur urges the Government of the Sudan urgently to stop the activities of the militias in violating the right to food and to ensure the protection of and assistance to displaced Sudanese in the reconstruction of their farms and livelihoods.

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

19. The Special Rapporteur continues to be gravely concerned at the situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which amount to violations of the obligations to respect, protect and fulfil the right to food and freedom from hunger. Over the last decade, hundreds of thousands of people have reportedly been killed by a "silent famine".[5] Millions continue to suffer from hunger and chronic malnutrition that have been caused by natural disasters, the loss of Soviet subsidies and restricted rights, including limits on the freedom of movement. Restrictions on access for humanitarian organizations mean that food aid, provided by the international community, has not always been distributed in accordance with the conditions of non-discrimination and transparency, and may not always have reached the hungriest. Amnesty International has recorded that people have been publicly executed for "economic crimes", such as stealing crops or cows for food, in order that the Government can maintain public order in the face of famine.[6]

20. The Special Rapporteur has also been concerned about the actions of the authorities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and China in relation to people from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea escaping into China.[7] The food crisis has pushed many people from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to escape hunger by "illegally" crossing the border into China. The Special Rapporteur has expressed grave concern regarding China's forced repatriation of these so-called "refugees from hunger". It is alleged that these people, after being repatriated by the Chinese authorities, are often subjected to severe punishment by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, usually condemning whole families to years in labour camps. The Special Rapporteur urges both Governments to end the persecution of these people and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to respect the right to food of its population under international human rights law. In its resolutions 2003/10 and 2004/13, the

Commission on Human Rights repeatedly called upon the Government to cooperate with the thematic procedures of the Commission, in particular the Special Rapporteur on the right to food. Accordingly, the Special Rapporteur has requested the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to allow a visit to examine the situation of the right to food in greater detail. He has also requested a meeting with the Chinese authorities to discuss these issues.

Cuba

21. In Cuba, the Special Rapporteur continues to be concerned by the maintenance of the United States of America's unilateral embargo against Cuba, and recent proposals for tightening of the embargo introduced by the report of the Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba.[8] This adds to the measures imposed by the 1996 Helms-Burton Act, under which economic sanctions are imposed not only on Cuba, but on all foreign companies that have commercial dealings with Cuba. There can be little doubt that this blockade has seriously damaged the Cuban economy. The further tightening of the embargo, which includes restricting family visits and remittances to Cuba and restricting development of the tourism industry, is likely to seriously damage the economy and affect the right to food of ordinary Cuban people. It is true that the United States has now made provision to allow donations and imports of food. But if the general embargo continues to devastate the economy and people's livelihoods, then this will endanger the right to food, which requires ensuring that people are able to feed themselves in dignity through adequate livelihoods.

22. The Special Rapporteur believes that the blockade constitutes a clear violation of international law. This is also the opinion of the international community. On 4 November 2003, the General Assembly adopted resolution 58/7, entitled "Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba". In 2004, the Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 2004/22, on "Human rights and unilateral coercive measures", invited all special rapporteurs to pay attention to the negative impacts of such measures. The Special Rapporteur has therefore requested the Government of Cuba to permit an official mission to Cuba to examine the situation of the right to adequate food, and the Government of the United States of America to provide further information. An official mission to Cuba would examine whether the intensification of the unilateral coercive measures will aggravate the situation with regard to the realization of the right to food and related rights in Cuba.

Occupied Palestinian Territories

23. In the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT), the Special Rapporteur is gravely concerned at the continued destruction and expropriation of Palestinian land and crops by the Israeli occupying forces through recent military operations, as well as the building of the "security barrier". These actions violate the obligations of the occupying army, as the occupying Power, to respect the right to food under international human rights and humanitarian law. Although the Special Rapporteur does not question the right of Israel to defend itself, he must still question the actions of the occupying forces inside Palestinian territories, where these are producing a humanitarian food crisis. As he indicated in the report of his mission in 2003 (E/CN.4/2004/10/Add.2), 22 per cent of Palestinian children are now gravely malnourished and approximately 50 per cent of Palestinians have become dependent

on food aid, as restrictions imposed on movement inside the territory have devastated the Palestinian economy. The occupying Power also reportedly extracts more than 85 per cent of the water from the West Bank aquifers. The International Court of Justice has declared the "security barrier" or "Wall" illegal, where it is built inside the Palestinian territories and does not follow the Green Line 1967 border between Israel and the territories. Numerous resolutions of the Commission and the General Assembly have also condemned the occupation and the building of the barrier on Palestinian land, as this requires destruction and confiscation of thousands of hectares of Palestinian land. Depriving thousands of Palestinians of access to their land, farms and livelihoods constitutes a violation of the right to food. The Special Rapporteur urges the Government of Israel to respect its obligations as occupying Power regarding the right to food.

24. In response to the escalation of recent military operations in Gaza, and referring to Commission on Human Rights resolution 2004/19, in which the Commission urged not only States, but also private actors, to promote the effective realization of the right to food, the Special Rapporteur has written to the Caterpillar corporation, expressing concern that the company's activities in supplying its specially modified armed D-9 and D-10 bulldozers to the occupying army, in full knowledge that they will be used to destroy farmland, greenhouses, crops and olive groves as well as water installations, might amount to complicity with or acceptance of actual and potential violations of the right to adequate food. The Special Rapporteur urges the Caterpillar corporation, and all other corporations, to commit to undertake responsibility to promote the effective realization of the right to food through, at the very least, avoiding complicity with actions that amount to a violation of the obligation to respect the right to food.

III. An update on the "voluntary guidelines" on the right to adequate food

25. Following a commitment made at the World Food Summit: five years later in 2002, Governments are currently involved in an intergovernmental process under the auspices of FAO to elaborate guidelines to progressively realize the right to food. The Special Rapporteur has participated in this process, in accordance with the mandate accorded to him by the Commission on Human Rights. He believes that this is an important international initiative that will help in raising awareness that the right to food is a human right, and that it is a right that must be respected and enforced around the world.

26. It should be remembered that the initiative to develop these "voluntary guidelines" grew out of commitments made by Governments themselves at the two World Food Summits. At the World Food Summit in 1996, Governments requested clarification of the meaning of the right to adequate food.[9] In response, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights produced its general comment No. 12, which defines the contents of the right to adequate food and outlines the meaning of the obligations to respect, protect and fulfil (facilitate and provide) the right to adequate food. At the World Food Summit: five years later in 2002, Governments again reaffirmed the right to food and requested the elaboration of practical guidelines on how to implement the right to adequate food. Since then,

Governments have been engaged for over two years in an effort to draft internationally accepted guidelines.

27. The Special Rapporteur is disappointed to report that, at the last meeting of Governments at FAO headquarters in Rome in July 2004, negotiations broke down without reaching a final consensus on the text of the draft "voluntary guidelines". Consensus broke down on a few outstanding issues — a divisive debate over the issue of international trade and assistance in relation to the right to food, and issues related to the protection of the right to food during situations of foreign occupation, as well as debate over the protection of human rights defenders. However, the negotiations did reach consensus on the majority of other issues and the Special Rapporteur urges Governments to finalize the voluntary guidelines at their next meeting in October 2004.

28. Although it remains too early to provide final comments on the voluntary guidelines, given the stalled nature of the negotiations, the Special Rapporteur was encouraged by the positive support to the right to food and the voluntary guidelines process of many Governments, including the Governments of Norway, Switzerland, Brazil and South Africa, as well as many other Governments within the Group of 77 developing countries. However, the Special Rapporteur was disappointed by the strong resistance of some other Governments, from the developed and the developing world, which worked hard to water down the language of the text on the political and legal obligations implied by the right to adequate food. Many phrases are rendered almost meaningless by the number of caveats introduced by non-committal language, especially in relation to accountability. As NGOs noted, the draft text is "no masterpiece of political will".[10]

29. The divisive nature of the negotiations, which frequently sought to prioritize national economic and political interests over the common goal of the right to food for all, was surprising. The two key issues which stalled the negotiations — the question of having guidelines on responsibilities related to international trade and assistance, and the question of protecting the right to food in times of occupation — were made in terms of legal arguments based on a narrow interpretation of the concept of the right to food. However, they also reflect broader economic and political interests of the countries concerned — including intransigent positions at the international level on trade (e.g. on agricultural subsidies) and the responsibilities of occupying Powers under international humanitarian law.

30. The market orientation encouraged in the text of the draft guidelines also risks inserting an ideological agenda into the promotion of human rights, which could undermine the view that human rights law does not support or condone any particular economic system, as long as rights are respected (as stated in general comment No. 3 of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights). Care should be taken to ensure that human rights are not used to promote particular types of economic system. The aim of the right to food is to ensure that every human being has physical and economic access to adequate food, but it does not require that specific economic systems be in place. The market orientation of the guidelines is reflected in the call for a market system and for a market-oriented trade system (despite the fact that subsidies are considered necessary to protect agriculture in developed countries). In the debate on the guidelines, concepts of "fair" or "equitable" market systems were rejected, although the guidelines do recognize that the markets may need to be regulated to ensure the right to food. During the debate,

the idea that human rights should treat basic needs as a matter of right, rather than charity, was also rejected by certain Governments. Yet the right to food does require that basic food security be considered a human right, with a corresponding obligation of Governments to act. To rely on charity does not guarantee the right to food and runs the risk of denying the dignity of the poor. The right to food is already a justiciable human right in many parts of the world, as evidenced in studies by FAO on the burgeoning amount of jurisprudence on the right to food.[11]

31. The Special Rapporteur continues to believe that the initiative to develop the "voluntary guidelines" is a valuable one. Despite its evident weaknesses, the draft text does reflect some important achievements in terms of understanding the right to food, which could be built on in the future. He still believes that the process in itself serves to underline the importance of enforcing the right to adequate food and raises awareness of how this right could be implemented. For these reasons, the Special Rapporteur has participated in the elaboration of the guidelines and has been broadly supportive of this initiative, although he has also raised a number of concerns about the process, which he hopes will be addressed in the final text.[12]

32. The broader political significance of the elaboration of the guidelines will perhaps be the most valuable outcome of the process of developing the voluntary guidelines. It is the first time that Governments have come together to debate fully the meanings and content of the right to food, even if this comes at an extremely difficult political and economic juncture. It has also taken human rights discussions outside of human rights circles. As NGOs have noted: "The voluntary guidelines have introduced the human rights discourse to a broader audience within the United Nations and within government bureaucracies beyond the departments responsible for human rights".[13] It has had a particularly significant impact within FAO, and therefore contributes to the goal of the Secretary-General to mainstream human rights throughout the United Nations system. FAO has produced a series of important papers on the right to food, including country case studies, examining the right to food in national situations, including on Brazil, Canada, South Africa, India and Uganda, as well as a series of other conceptual papers, on issues such as trade rules, trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights, food aid, safety nets, food sovereignty and their linkages to the right to food.[14] These recognize, for example, the need to "balance economic growth and trade policies with right to food policies" and that "equitable access to resources and assets such as natural resources, including land, is very important for the right to food".

IV. The right to adequate food and fishing livelihoods

33. This section explores an emerging issue of concern regarding equitable access to productive and natural resources for the poor, focusing on capture fishing (both inland and coastal) and fish-farming communities that traditionally survive through their access to local fishing grounds. It examines how, in the drive to industrialize, privatize and orient fish production towards exports, poor fishing and fish-farming communities are often left behind, if their rights over these resources are not protected. Although some employment may be gained by the global restructuring and industrialization of the fishing industry, poor and marginalized people may be displaced from their livelihoods if these changes work to effectively deny their access to resources. From the perspective of the right to food, it is essential to protect access to sustainable fishery resources for poor and marginalized

communities, especially where this provides their primary means of livelihood and where few alternative opportunities exist.

34. A number of civil society organizations have called on the Special Rapporteur to examine the special situation of marginalized fishing and fish-farming communities. These organizations include the World Forum of Fisherpeoples, the International Collective in Support of Fishworkers (ICFS), the Centre de recherche pour le développement des technologies intermédiaires de pêche (CREDETIP), the Industrial Shrimp Action Network and FIAN. These organizations are very concerned that today, at a time of increasing scarcity of fishing resources, new developments in global and local fisheries management do not support artisanal and small-scale fisheries but rather constitute a threat to their livelihoods and therefore to their right to food.

Linkages between fisheries and the right to food

35. Fisheries provide both food and livelihoods, particularly for poor and marginalized communities living in coastal areas, but also inland communities dependent on freshwater fishing or traditional methods of raising fish. The right to food of these communities is therefore closely linked to their access to and control over fishing resources. It is extremely important to ensure that fishing communities have secure rights of access to sustainably managed fishing resources.

36. Fish, as food for consumption, is an important part of the right to food. FAO reports[15] that more than one billion people worldwide rely on fish as their major source of animal protein. In some of the less developed areas of the world, fish is often the most important source of animal protein in poor people's diets. Fish accounts for 23.1 per cent of total animal protein intake in Asia and 19 per cent in Africa, and this average figure is higher for coastal and fishing communities.[16] Fish is an important source of protein, but also provides vitamins A, D, B1 and B2, iron, phosphorus and calcium, iodine, fatty acids — all nutrients that are essential for physical and mental development, especially for young children.

37. Fisheries also provide a livelihood for millions of poor people. It provides employment and income from fishing or fish farming, processing and marketing fish. It is estimated that 35 million people are directly engaged in fishing and fish farming, and approximately another 100 million people work in fisheries-related occupations. Around 97 per cent of all fishery workers live and work in developing countries — the majority in Asia (85 per cent), followed by Africa (7 per cent) with far fewer employed in Europe, North America and South and Central America (about 2 per cent each).[17] Most of these people work in small-scale artisanal or subsistence fisheries to provide nourishment for their families and communities. Millions of people around the world therefore depend in some way on fishing and fish farming livelihoods for their income, making it paramount that they have secure access to these resources and that these resources are not overfished, but used at sustainable levels.

Current challenges to the right to food for fishing and fish-farming communities

38. Global fish production has rapidly expanded in recent years, reaching 130 million tons in 2000, up from 40 million tons in 1961. There are two types of fish production — fish captured in the wild from the sea or inland waters (capture fisheries), and fish farmed in the sea or inland waters (aquaculture). Of global fish

production, most fish is still captured at sea (66 per cent) with some fish caught inland (7 per cent); however, fish farming is rapidly expanding and now makes up 27 per cent of global production (11 per cent at sea, 16 per cent inland).[18] In the face of this rapidly increasing global fish production and the growing overexploitation of marine fishing resources,[19] there have been a number of recent changes in the global and local fisheries management.

Marine fishing

39. In the past, access to global marine fishing resources was generally based on open access or traditional customary rules. Over the last two decades, however, in order to overcome conflicts between countries and between fisheries — industrial versus artisanal, export-based versus subsistence — and the overexploitation of marine fish stocks, there have been attempts to regulate access to fishing resources through the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 and several subsequent agreements. While these agreements have aimed at protecting equity in access to marine fishing and some agreements have aimed to protect artisanal fishing livelihoods, in practice, this has not always worked and there remain inequities in practice between developed and developing countries.

40. The Convention on the Law of the Sea guarantees the rights of countries to their own fishing resources in their territorial waters and exclusive economic zone. National jurisdictions now cover nearly 99 per cent of the world's fishery resources. Each country is obliged to calculate an "allowable catch" (the level of sustainable harvest) and is obliged to avoid overexploitation of its own resources. Each country is bound, if it does not have the capacity to fish all its allowable catch, to give access to other countries. However, the terms of this access are supposed to be regulated in ways which first consider national interests and local livelihoods, then consider the needs of regional countries, especially landlocked and geographically disadvantaged countries, and only finally other countries. This Convention attempts to strengthen the rights of countries to their own fishing resources.

41. Subsequent agreements accord special recognition of the needs of poorer countries and the need for protection to artisanal and small-scale fisheries. These include the Agreement for the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks[20] and the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries of 1995. The FAO Code of Conduct states that:

> "Recognizing the important contributions of artisanal and small-scale fisheries to employment, income and food security, States should appropriately protect the rights of fishers and fishworkers, particularly those engaged in subsistence, small-scale and artisanal fisheries, to a secure and just livelihood, as well as preferential access, where appropriate, to traditional fishing grounds and resources in the waters under their national jurisdiction" (art. 6.18).

42. There are now many agreements and organizations set up between countries to try to implement these principles and protect artisanal and small-scale fisheries. For example, in Asia, the Bay of Bengal organization tries to protect fishers in member countries (Bangladesh, India, Maldives and Sri Lanka). In Africa, a Sub-Regional Commission on Fisheries brings together Cape Verde, the Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritania and Senegal. In Latin America, another organization (the Organización Latinoamericana de Desarrollo Pesquero) with members from almost

all South and Central American countries has initiated a project focused on artisanal fisheries.

43. Today, however, many of these valuable efforts to improve equity of access to fishing resources between developed and developing countries are undermined by policies and activities of developed countries, including subsidies. Subsidies are estimated to total at least US$ 15 billion annually.[21] About 90 per cent of total subsidies are granted by Japan, the European Union, the United States of America, Canada and the Russian Federation to their fishing fleets and fishing industry. In the past, these subsidies have led to the overexploitation of marine resources in developed countries.[22] This has led them to demand greater access rights to the fishing resources of developing countries, and subsidies have permitted the growth of fishing fleets capable of travelling long distances. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) has reported, for example, that the EU paid US$ 230 million in subsidies to its fishing fleets to enable them to take advantage of fishing rights obtained in the Argentine exclusive economic zone.[23]

44. Inequities in bilateral fishing negotiations also sometimes mean that international agreements fail to take account of equity concerns, the potential impact on poor fishing communities or the ways in which such agreements might undermine the efforts of regional and subregional organizations to protect artisanal and small-scale fisheries. In its recent fishing agreement with Senegal, for example, the EU managed to obtain fishing rights over species that are endangered or locally used, which has allegedly threatened the food security of thousands of local fishing communities.[24] Guidelines for negotiations, such as those in World Wildlife Fund (WWF) "Handbook for Negotiating Fishing Access Agreement",[25] should therefore be taken into account in this context.

45. Poorer countries often do not have the capacity to monitor fishing in their territorial waters and therefore can lose out to illegal fishing (both large-scale and small-scale operations). According to FAO, "IUU (illegal, unreported and unregulated) fishing is increasing in both intensity and scope, and is seriously undermining national and regional efforts to sustainably manage fisheries".[26] Many non-governmental organizations point to the fact that poorer countries, in particular, often do not have the capacity to monitor fishing in their territorial waters and exclusive economic zones and therefore lose out to illegal fishing. Non-governmental organizations have suggested that the inability of countries to monitor their waters is partly due to globalized economic policies, which restrict the capacity of the State to undertake monitoring activities. The International Collective in Support of Fishworkers argues that "neo-liberal policies that support decentralization and the withdrawal of the State are also a matter for concern. Cutting back of State participation has also meant that fewer resources are now available for monitoring, control and surveillance (MCS) activities."[27]

46. At the more local level, global policies driving privatization and an export orientation for marine fishing sometimes end up depriving local people of their traditional rights of access to fishing resources. In the past, open-access fishery resources or those regulated through traditional or community access systems allowed local people access to fishing resources, although these rights were not formally codified. However, on the basis that these open-access systems have suffered from overexploitation, recent attempts to control overexploitation have sometimes ended up restricting the access of artisanal and subsistence fishers,

effectively punishing them, even though it is often large-scale fishing that is most responsible for overfishing. For example, recent attempts to regulate access through replacing regulation with the ITQ ("individual transferable quotas") system has amounted to an effective privatization of fishing resources. If the initial design fails to include and protect the poor, this can result in the exclusion of traditional fishing communities from access to their marine resources. Although the ITQ system need not exclude small artisanal and subsistence fishers, in practice, it has favoured commercial fishing at the expense of these groups, whose methods are considered inefficient. Some argue that the ITQ system has been used to systematically shift control over fishing resources from the poor to the rich.[28] It is possible to allocate quotas to traditional fishers, which can strengthen their property rights, but only if quotas are allocated fairly and there are safeguard mechanisms in place to ensure that the poor can maintain their quotas and to ensure against monopolization of ownership. There are examples in which reallocation of rights has strengthened the access of poorer communities, such as the reallocation of Canadian salmon fishery to indigenous peoples, which show how allocation systems can be designed specifically to protect the rights of marginalize communities.[29] However, many argue that reallocation processes are often inequitable in practice:

> "People with higher incomes have a disproportionately large claim to the world's fishery resources. It is not only a matter of the rich outbidding the poor in the marketplace. It is also a matter of the rich controlling much of the supply process, including its regulation."[30]

47. According to one study, for example, the Government of Chile instituted a "transitory fishery law" in 2001 that established the quota system. Under the new allocation system, the industrial sector was able to obtain the great majority of the quotas at the expense of the poor. In the case of one fish, horse mackerel (*Trachurus murphyii*), it is reported that the industrial fishery sector obtained 98 per cent of the annual quota. Yet this fish is an important resource for local artisanal fishers and an important source of food security, while the industrial fishery uses the fish to transform into animal feed.[31]

48. The non-governmental organization FIAN has reported cases of alleged violations of the right to food affecting indigenous fishing communities in the Russian Federation. FIAN reports that, under new regulations on access to fishing resources, the Aleut community on Bering Island has not been granted adequate fishing quotas to maintain the food security of the traditional fishing community.[32] FIAN also highlights another case on Sakhalin Island where indigenous communities were not granted any fishing quota for subsistence consumption of Siberian salmon (*keta*), or humpback salmon (*gorbusha*), even though these species make up their basic source of traditional food and they depend on fishing livelihoods, given persistent high unemployment in the area.[33] Another case alleges that, in the waters of the Nyiskii gulf on the north-east coast of Sakhalin, the local salmon has been decimated by seismic-prospection submarine explosives used in the search for oil by corporations, including transnational corporations Esso and BP, without consultation or compensation to local communities. Under the right to food, Governments have an obligation to protect communities from the negative impact of non-State actors, such as corporations, on their food security and should institute compensation where this right has been violated.

49. In another case, non-governmental fishing organizations in South Africa have reported that the Government's new fisheries policy, under the Marine Living Resource Act 18 of 1998, which officially aimed to design an equitable fishing policy, has worked in practice to exclude a large number of artisanal and subsistence fishers in the Southern and Western Cape from their previous access to fishing resources.[34] Non-governmental organizations argue that, under the new law, there is no recognition of "artisanal fishers" as a separate category of fishers, as they are subsumed in the category of the commercial sector, which the fishing organizations allege does not meet the very different needs of the artisanal fishers. With the adoption of an ITQ quota system, they suggest that the fishing resources have been to some extent privatized out of the hands of the fishing communities. They argue that a large number of traditional artisanal and subsistence fishers were not granted quotas and have therefore lost access to their traditional fishing resources. They cannot now undertake fishing without breaking the law, even if they fish for their families' consumption. It is also alleged that a shift towards export orientation now requires that certain fish, such as abalone, be sold to private industrial processing companies to be sold on export markets and cannot be sold on local markets. This affects the community-based trade in fish that supported the broader fishing community. They allege that, as a result of the new law, food insecurity among the fishing communities is increasing, particularly given that relatively few fishers are finding new jobs in the industrialized fishing sector. The fisherfolk have held public hearings to discuss their plight and may bring a case to court to challenge their effective exclusion from access to fishing resources.[35]

50. With the shift towards the export orientation of the fish industry, developing countries now account for half of global fish exports and their net export trade increased from US$ 10 billion in 1990 to US$ 18 billion in 2000 (more than the net export value of coffee, bananas, rice and tea taken together).[36] However, it is not clear whether the income gained from these exports is generally benefiting poorer fishing communities, given the simultaneous shift towards the privatization of fishing resources, which has not always improved the access rights of the poorest. It is suggested that the shift to export orientation of fish economies in Asia, for example, has "led to the marginalization of communities that had been traditionally involved in fishing and fish processing".[37]

Fish farming

51. In response to the overexploitation of marine fishing resources, the fish industry is moving increasingly towards fish farming (called aquaculture) for the further expansion of global fish production. Aquaculture production has rapidly grown in recent years, reaching 35.6 million tons in 2000, compared to 1.9 million tons in 1961. At the current rate, it is estimated that fish farming will overtake fish capture by the year 2020.[38] Most fish farming is located in developing countries (with 84 per cent of global production in low-income food deficit countries), particularly in China, India, the Philippines and Indonesia. Fish farming is frequently promoted on the promise that it will relieve pressure on wild fish stocks and improve food security and provide livelihoods for the poor. However, fish farming does not automatically relieve exploitation of marine stocks — given that many farm fish are, ironically, fed with marine fish.[39] And, while it has promoted food security in some countries, such as China, where fish farming remains small-

scale and most fish is consumed locally, this is generally not the case where fish farming that is industrial in scale and export-oriented.

52. Although traditional, low-technology methods of fish farming have been practised for many centuries by inland and coastal communities to supplement food security, particularly in Asia, these traditional methods are very different from new industrialized methods of fish farming. In India, Bangladesh and Thailand, for example, there is a tradition of rice/shrimp rotation, with rice grown for part of the year and shrimp and other fish cultured on land the rest of the year. No chemicals, antibiotics or processed feed are used in this method, which is low-yield but sustainable over the long term.[40] New industrial methods of fish farming, on the other hand, use highly technical methods based on intense production, dense stocking rates with artificial feed, chemical additives and antibiotics to improve production "efficiency". These new methods require high capital investment, which often excludes poorer farmers from engaging in this kind of production. Although these new methods are often promoted in the name of reducing hunger, in practice this type of farming rarely benefits the poor. According to one study on shrimp farming:

> "Like the earlier Green Revolution, the Blue Revolution is frequently promoted as a way to help feed the world's hungry by increasing the supply of affordable food. The results of the Blue Revolution have been exactly the opposite ... One of the most critical social problems identified by local peoples as part of expansion of the Blue Revolution is the loss of communal resources — including mangrove areas, estuaries, and fishing grounds — that local people depend on for both subsistence and commercial economic activities. Commercial shrimp farming has displaced local communities, exacerbated conflicts and provoked violence involving property and tenant rights, decreased the quality and quantity of drinking water, increased local food insecurity and threatened human health."[41]

53. In a landmark case in India on shrimp farming and its impact on livelihoods, the Supreme Court of India found that damage caused by shrimp farming had resulted in the loss of land for subsistence farming in favour of export shrimp production, the loss of access to the beach, important as landing grounds for fish catch, and the loss of access to safe drinking water with inadequate drainage systems contributing to "skin, eye and waterborne diseases in the contiguous population".[42] In addition, shrimp farming had not resulted in increased employment and the damage caused to local livelihoods and ecology was considered to be greater than the total earnings from shrimp farming. The case suggests that both local marine fishers and agricultural farmers had lost livelihoods and subsistence food production as a result of the expansion of shrimp production, through both the takeover of land and the environmental impacts.

54. Although it is clearly true that fish farming can create employment, especially where it is practised on a small scale, non-governmental organizations have challenged the generalized claim that industrialized fish farming brings more employment for the poor, showing how it often displaces other local livelihoods that generate far more employment. For example, in India, shrimp production has displaced rice production by small farmers along coastal stretches and total levels of employment have fallen. While rice production employs on average 76 workers per hectare, shrimp production employs only 26 workers per hectare. According to the

activist Vandana Shiva, in Tamil Nadu total export revenue from shrimp production (US$ 868 million) came at the expense of job loss and environmental destruction totalling an amount far greater (US$ 1.38 billion).[43]

A right-to-food approach to fisheries

55. The right to food is a human right, under which Governments have a legal obligation to guarantee economic and physical access to food for everyone. The right to food implies obligations on Governments to ensure that all people have physical and economic access to an adequate quantity and quality of food, without discrimination. It also requires Governments to comply with the obligation to respect, protect and fulfil the right to food, as outlined in the introduction of this report.

56. In relation to fisheries, the obligation to respect means that the State should not take actions that arbitrarily deprive people of their existing access to adequate food. The obligation to protect means that the State should enforce appropriate laws to prevent third parties, including powerful people and corporations, from depriving individuals of their access to adequate food. Finally, the obligation to fulfil (facilitate and provide) means that the State should take positive actions to identify vulnerable groups and should elaborate and implement appropriate policies and programmes to ensure their access to adequate food by facilitating their ability to feed themselves. As a last resort, the Government is also required to provide adequate food to those who cannot feed themselves, for reasons beyond their own control. It is also fundamental that participation, accountability and access to effective remedies be ensured at all times and at all levels of the implementation of the right to food. Governments are obliged to ensure the progressive realization of the right to food.

57. It is vital that changes in the fishing industry do not precipitate an increase in food insecurity and a reduction in the physical or economic accessibility of food for the fishing communities or other surrounding communities. This would amount to a regression in the realization of the right to adequate food. The obligation of Governments to the progressive realization of the right to food means that people's standard of living and level of food security should consistently improve, not deteriorate.

58. The obligation to respect the people's *existing* access to food is frequently being violated, not only through direct actions, but also through policies that have failed to protect artisanal and subsistence fisheries. Human rights and social impact assessments should be carried out before instituting legislative and policy changes in the fishing industry in order to measure the impacts if fishers lose their access to their traditional fishing resources, such as in the cases mentioned above in Chile, South Africa and the Russian Federation. To deprive people of livelihoods and their access to food, without compensation or in an arbitrary or discriminatory way, is a clear violation of the obligation to respect people's *existing* access to food. This is particularly the case when there is no alternative employment, especially if or when the new fisheries industry structure fails to provide employment equal to that lost through the restructuring. Rights of access should be secured and compensation offered in cases where reallocation leaves traditional fishing communities with no access to their traditional resources.

59. The obligation to protect the right to food is also often violated. In the case mentioned above for the Russian Federation, for example, the local salmon has been decimated by seismic-prospection submarine explosives in the search for oil by corporations, including the transnational corporations Esso and BP, in the waters of the Nyiskii gulf on the Northeast coast of Sakhalin, without any consultation or compensation to local communities. This amounts to a violation of the obligation to protect the right to food.

60. The obligation to fulfil the right to food is also frequently being violated. This obligation is violated when there are no policies and programmes in place to improve the livelihoods of fishing and fish-farming communities, and to secure their access to resources, especially if the industry changes leave poor marginalized communities with no alternative livelihoods or employment. As a last resort, the Government must provide assistance and safety nets to those who cannot feed themselves. However, ensuring livelihoods so that people can feed themselves in dignity must take priority. Numerous positive examples already exist that show that it is possible to support artisanal and subsistence fishers. Brazil, for example, has adopted a comprehensive Programme for the Support and Development of Artisanal Fisheries. At the regional level, Latin American countries are currently in the process of establishing a "regional project for artisanal fisheries" that will support artisanal fisheries in all the countries of the region. These will help to ensure that traditional fishing communities are not simply left behind.

V. Conclusions and recommendations

61. **The Special Rapporteur submits the following recommendations:**

(a) **The trend of increasing world hunger and undernourishment must be reversed. Governments must implement their commitments made at the World Food Summits in 1996 and 2002 and their Millennium Declaration commitments. All Governments which are parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights must take immediate actions to guarantee the progressive realization of the right to adequate food, in accordance with their international human rights obligations;**

(b) **Urgent actions must be taken by the Government of the Sudan and the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to stop violations of the right to food of their people. The Government of Israel, in accordance with its obligations as occupying Power under international human rights and humanitarian law, should refrain violating the right to food in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. The Government of the United States of America should also refrain from imposing measures on the citizens of Cuba that may violate their right to food;**

(c) **Governments should complete negotiations on the voluntary guidelines and ensure that these will be a practical tool to enable the realization of the right to food for all as a common goal. In the final phase of negotiations, Governments should focus on the goal of protecting the right to food, particularly for poor and marginalized communities across the world for whom this right is so frequently violated;**

(d) Governments should not implement any policies or programmes that run counter to their legal obligations to realize the right to food. The progressive realization of the right to food means that levels of food security should consistently improve over time. Arbitrary and discriminatory actions that exclude poor people from access to their resources and access to their existing right to food are unacceptable;

(e) In the case of communities dependent on fish and fishing resources, Governments must comply with obligations to respect, protect and fulfil the right to adequate food. This means that it must ensure that artisanal and subsistence fishers are not arbitrarily excluded from their access to fishing resources. Governments must also provide protection to small-scale fisheries against negative impacts of actions undertaken by corporations or other private actors. Priority must be given in the first instance to protecting livelihoods. Adequate compensation for any loss of existing access to resources must be instituted for those whose livelihoods and food security are not respected or protected. Where policies of restructuring the fishing industry are put in place, Governments must ensure that the needs of poor and marginalized communities are respected. Impact analysis of policy shifts must analyse potential impacts on all groups and ensure that all needs are met in a way that avoids potential for regression in the realization of the right to adequate food;

(f) In the Kyoto Declaration, adopted at the International Conference on the Sustainable Contribution of Fisheries to Food Security, Governments agreed in 1995 that trade in fish should promote food security and not "adversely impact on the nutritional rights and needs of people for whom fish and fishery products are critical to their health and well-being".[44] The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in its article 28, proclaimed that "everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which [these] rights and freedoms ... can be fully realized". The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in its article 11, paragraph 2, further stipulates that States parties shall take measures to "ensure an equitable distribution of world food supplies in relation to need". Therefore, all Governments have a responsibility to ensure that their activities do not have negative impacts on the right to food of people in other countries, and should seek to ensure an equitable distribution of resources.

62. It is a shame on humanity that today, in 2004, one child under the age of 5 should die every five seconds from hunger-related diseases. We cannot continue to let people die from hunger and chronic malnourishment. How can we continue to live with this shame? It is time to enforce the right to food.

Notes

[1] World Food Programme, 2004 World Hunger Map. The rate has increased from one child every seven seconds, since the 2001 Hunger Map.

[2] FAO, "Implementing the right to adequate food: the outcome of six case studies" (IGWG RTFG/INF4), p. 13. Available at ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/meeting/008/j2475e.pdf.

[3] For more information, see: http://www.prosalus.es/derechoAl/deDerecho.asp.

[4] For more information, see: http://www.fian.org/.

[5] Amnesty International, 2004 "Starved of rights: human rights and the food crisis in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea".

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid.

[8] See http://www.state.gov/documents.

[9] Objective 7.4 of the World Food Summit Plan of Action.

[10] NGO caucus, "Final evaluation: no masterpiece of political will", issued 10 July 2004.

[11] See FAO reports available at: http://www.fao.org/righttofood/en/index.html.

[12] See the fifth submission of the Special Rapporteur, posted at www.righttofood.org.

[13] NGO caucus, ibid.

[14] These reports and country studies are available at: http://www.fao.org/righttofood/en/index.html.

[15] See FAO Newsroom Focus "Aquaculture: not just an export industry" at http://www.fao.org/english/newsroom/focus/2003/aquaculture.htm.

[16] G. Kent, 2003, *Fish Trade, Food Security and the Human Right to Adequate Food.*

[17] FAO, *the State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture*, 2002.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid. According to FAO statistics, today about 47 per cent of the major marine fish stocks or species groups are fully exploited and offer no reasonable expectations for further expansion, another 18 per cent of stocks or species groups are overexploited and 10 per cent have become significantly depleted or are recovering from depletion, leaving only 25 per cent of the main stocks or species groups underexploited or moderately exploited.

[20] The Agreement for the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (art. 5(i) and 24) of 1995.

[21] WWF, *Turning the Tide on Fishing Subsidies. Can the World Trade Organization play a Positive Role?*

[22] UNEP, 2004, *Fisheries and the Environment: Fisheries Subsidies and Overfishing: Towards a Structured Discussion.*

[23] UNEP, 2004, *Fisheries and the Environment. Fisheries Subsidies and Marine Resources Management: Lessons learned from Studies in Argentina and Senegal.*

[24] Ibid.

[25] See http://www.worldwildlife.org/oceans/pdfs/access_agreements.pdf.

[26] FAO, press release, "Countries debate strategies for managing fleet capacities and combating illegal fishing", 1 July 2004.

[27] International Collective in Support of Fishworkers, 2000, *Workshop on Gender and Coastal Fishing Communities in Latin America.* See http://www.icsf.net/jsp/publication/reports/Workshop-withmap.pdf.

[28] G. Kent, op. cit.

[29] See http://www.bcafc.org.

[30] G. Kent, op. cit.

[31] G. Kent, op. cit.

[32] FIAN, RAIPON (the Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North), INFOE (the Institute for Ecology and Action Anthropology), 2003, "The right to adequate food (art.11) and

violations of this right in the Russian Federation. Parallel information to the fourth periodic report of the Russian Federation, submitted by the Russian Government to the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/C.12/4/Add.10)."

[33] FIAN, RAIPON, INFOE, 2003, op. cit.

[34] Isaacs, M., 2004, "Understanding the social processes and politics of implementing a new fisheries policy, the Marine Living Resource Act 18 of 1998, in South Africa".

[35] Fisherfolk public hearing (an NGO initiative that looked into fishing licences for fisherfolk), Kalk Bay and Hermanus, August 2004.

[36] Source: FAO, 2002.

[37] John Kurien, 2002, *the Blessing of the Commons: Small-Scale Fisheries, Community Property Rights, and Coastal Natural Assets*. Political Economy Research Institute, University of Massachusetts Amherst, Conference Paper Series No. 2.

[38] FAO, 2004, Aquaculture — Trade, Trends, Standards and Outlooks.

[39] R. L. Naylor, R. J. Goldburg, J. H. Primavera, N. Kautsky, M. C. M. Beveridge, J. Clay, C. Folkes, J. Lubchenco, H. Mooney, M. Troell, 2000, "Effect of Aquaculture on World Fish Supplies", *Nature*, vol. 405, pp. 1017-1024.

[40] Supreme Court of India, *S. Jagannath v. Union of India (Aquaculture case)*, WP 561/1994 (1996.12.11).

[41] S. C. Stonich, I. De La Torre, 2002, "Farming shrimp, harvesting hunger : the costs and benefits of the Blue Revolution".

[42] Supreme Court of India, *Aquaculture case*.

[43] Lahiri, D. L (ed.), "Pink Revolution: Right to livelihood of the coastal poor. A case study on shrimp monoculture. Kolkata, India.

[44] Kyoto Declaration issued at the International Conference on the Sustainable Contribution of Fish to Food Security in 1995.

United Nations A/59/386

General Assembly

Distr.: General
27 September 2004

Original: English

Fifty-ninth session
Agenda item 90 (b)
Operational activities for development: triennial policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system

Comprehensive statistical data on operational activities for development for 2003

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report is submitted in addition to the report of the Secretary-General containing comprehensive statistical data on operational activities for development for 2002 (A/59/84-E/2004/53) and in compliance with General Assembly resolution 35/81 of 5 December 1980. It complements the reports of the Secretary-General on implementation of Assembly resolution 56/201 (A/59/85-E/2004/68 and A/59/387) and provides preliminary statistical data on resources channelled through the organizations of the United Nations system for 2003.

Owing to the unavailability of some data, this addendum is incomplete. A revised addendum will be submitted to the Economic and Social Council at its substantive session of 2005.

04-52529 (E) 281004

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Introduction	1–5	3
II.	Note on statistical information	6–17	3
Tables			
	Contributions from Governments and other sources for operational activities of the United Nations system		
A-1.	Contributions from Governments and other sources for operational activities of the United Nations system: overview, 1999-2003		6
A-2.	Contributions for operational activities of the United Nations system, by donor, 2003		8
A-3.	Contributions for operational activities of the United Nations system, by donor, 2003 (continued)		16
A-4.	Extrabudgetary contributions for operational activities of specialized and technical agencies, 2003		21
A-5.	Extrabudgetary contributions for operational activities of specialized and technical agencies: overview by donor, 1999-2003		22
A-6.	Extrabudgetary contributions for operational activities of specialized and technical agencies: overview by agency, 1999-2003		23
	Expenditures on operational activities of the United Nations system		
B-1.	Expenditures on operational activities of the United Nations system: overview, 1999-2003		24
B-2.	Expenditures on operational activities of the United Nations system, by recipient country or region, 2003 (Development grants and loans from IFAD)		25
B-3.	Expenditures on operational activities of the United Nations system, regional summary 2003		32
B-4.	Expenditures on grant-financed development activities, by organization or agency of the United Nations system and other entities, 2003		33
B-5.	Expenditures on grant-financed development activities of the United Nations system, by sector, 2003		34
B-6.	United Nations system: expenditures on operational activities for development in the least developed countries 2001-2003, by source of funding		35
	Procurement activities of the United Nations development system		
C.	Total procurement, by agency, 2002-2003		36

I. Introduction

1. The present document has been prepared in accordance with the requirements contained in paragraph 17 of General Assembly resolution 35/81 of 5 December 1980.

2. It is divided into three parts:

(a) Contributions from Governments and other sources to operational activities of the United Nations system (tables A-1 to A-6);

(b) Expenditures on operational activities of the United Nations system (tables B-1 to B-6);

(c) Procurement activities of the United Nations development system (table C).

Each part consists of a number of tables that may facilitate a study of the subject from different angles and perspectives. Table B-6 also covers expenditures on operational activities of the United Nations system in the least developed countries.

3. The main sources of the statistical tables are the financial statements of the United Nations funds and programmes, including the World Food Programme (WFP), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and previous statistical addenda to the reports on operational activities of the United Nations system.

4. Tables A-1, A-5, A-6 and B-1 cover information for 1999-2003; table B-6 covers information for 2001-2003; all other tables deal with 2003 data only.

5. Data on the World Bank Group are not included in the present report; such data may be found in relevant World Bank publications.

II. Note on statistical information

General note

6. Coverage, definition and sources for the figures used in the present report are consistent with those for previous years' reports in this series. Modifications have been made to data presentation, column headings and table titles in the interest of greater clarity and internal consistency. Explanations of special cases or of instances in which table totals do not match are given in the footnotes to tables.

Definitions and explanations

7. Data are derived from the financial statements of the United Nations funds and programmes; see also footnotes to tables A-1 and B-1.

8. Data on contributions refer to actual contributions received in a given calendar year from Governments and other sources by organizations in the United Nations system, and the net profits from the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) greeting card operation. Data on other income related to resource transfers from one agency of the system to another are excluded.

9. Data on expenditures and disbursements represent the support provided by organizations to the programmes and projects of developing countries; administrative, programme and other support costs, where identifiable, are excluded.

10. UNICEF and WFP carry out both development assistance and some activities which are of a humanitarian or emergency character. Because of the difficulty of separate identifications, the related contributions and expenditures are all grouped under development assistance.

11. The expression "United Nations funds and programmes" refers to the funds and programmes listed by the General Assembly for participation in the annual United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities to the resources for operational activities of the organizational entities of the United Nations (see table B-4), and to other United Nations trust funds pertaining to development activities.

12. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in the present report do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

13. The term "country" as used in the present report also refers, as appropriate, to territories or areas.

14. References to dollars ($) are to United States dollars unless otherwise stated. A full stop is used to indicate decimals. Two dots (..) indicate that data are not available or are not separately reported. A minus sign (-) indicates a deficit or decrease, except as otherwise indicated. A dash (-) indicates that the amount is nil or negligible or that the item is not applicable. A hyphen (-) between dates representing years signifies the full period involved, including the beginning and end years.

15. Details and percentages in tables do not necessarily add to totals, because of rounding.

16. The following abbreviations have been used:

CEB	United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
ECE	Economic Commission for Europe
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
ESCWA	Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GCO	Greeting card operations (UNICEF)
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization

IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IMO	International Maritime Organization
ITC	International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT
ITU	International Telecommunication Union
NEX	National execution
RB	Regular budget
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNCHS	United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat)
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UN/DESA	United Nations/Department for Economic and Social Affairs
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNON	United Nations Office at Nairobi
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UPU	Universal Postal Union
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
WIPO	World Intellectual Property Organization
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WTO	World Tourism Organization
XB	Extrabudgetary

17. Explanations for additional terms and definitions are given in the footnotes to tables A-1 and B-1.

Table A-1. Contributions from Governments and other sources for operational activities of the United Nations system: overview, 1999-2003
(Millions of current US dollars)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS FUNDS AND PROGRAMMES					
1. Contributions to UNDP					
a) CORE	681.3	634.1	651.7	663.1	769.9
b) OTHER RES. a/	1 393.0	1 375.7	1 569.2	1 706.9	2 015.6
Subtotal	2 074.3	2 009.8	2 220.9	2 370.0	2 785.5
2. Contributions to UNDP administered funds and trust funds b/					
a) CORE	47.6	45.6	50.3	46.8	53.2
b) OTHER RES. a/	11.8	13.5	15.0	24.5	24.0
Subtotal	59.4	59.1	65.3	71.3	77.2
Total (1-2)	**2 133.7**	**2 068.9**	**2 286.2**	**2 441.3**	**2 862.7**
3. Contributions to UNFPA c/					
a) CORE	244.1	256.4	260.2	246.5	288.5
b) OTHER RES. a/	30.2	130.6	103.6	92.4	86.0
Subtotal	274.3	387.0	363.8	338.9	374.5
4. Contributions to UNICEF d/					
a) CORE	585.9	596.7	541.4	697.2	724.0
b) OTHER RES. a/	500.2	515.6	638.9	702.0	840.1
Subtotal	1 086.1	1 112.3	1 180.3	1 399.2	1 564.1
5. Contributions to other United Nations funds and programmes e/	369.5	364.1	495.9	521.1	569.2
6. Contributions to WFP f/					
a) CORE	1 512.6	1 532.1	1 755.9	1 894.8	2 792.0
b) OTHER RES. a/	54.2	39.2	38.1	11.7	28.0
Subtotal	1 566.8	1 571.3	1 794.0	1 906.5	2 820.0
Total (1-6)	**5 430.4**	**5 503.6**	**6 120.2**	**6 607.0**	**8 190.5**
CONTRIBUTIONS FOR OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES					
7. Assessed contributions to regular budgets g/	444.0	469.6	424.0	479.3	518.2
8. Extrabudgetary contributions	975.8	1 178.3	1 189.3	1 032.1	1 466.8
Total (7-8)	**1 419.8**	**1 647.9**	**1 613.3**	**1 511.4**	**1 985.0**
Grand total	**6 850.2**	**7 151.5**	**7 733.5**	**8 118.4**	**10 175.5**

Table A-1. (continued)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
CONTRIBUTIONS TO IFAD					
9. Contributions to IFAD	122.8	127.1	41.8	19.6	193.9
MEMO ITEMS					
EXPLANATORY ITEMS					
UNICEF Greeting Cards	202.9	163.3	161.0	125.9	151.5
Government "self-supporting" contributions to organizations and agencies	218.5	196.5	262.2	201.1	233.2

SOURCE: Financial statements of United Nations funds and programmes and of WFP; IFAD.

a/ Includes cost-sharing and government cash counterpart contributions.

b/ Includes the Capital Development Fund, the Special Fund for Land-Locked Developing Countries, the Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration, the Special United Nations Volunteer Fund, the United Nations Fund for Science and Technology for Development, the United Nations Development Fund for Women and the Trust Fund for Sudano-Sahelian Activities; and other funds, accounts and trust funds of UNDP, including trust funds established by the Administrator, and contributions for the Junior Professional Officers programme. Includes cost-sharing contributions to these funds.

c/ Includes contributions to trust funds and "special population programmes" of UNFPA.

d/ Includes net profit from sale of greeting cards, which resources are then used in operational activities.

e/ Constitutes regular budget and extrabudgetary contributions, including government self-supporting contributions, in relation to the United Nations and its regional commissions, UNCHS, UNCTAD and UNDCP. See also the annual UNDP document on United Nations system regular and extrabudgetary technical cooperation financed from sources other than UNDP.

f/ Includes contributions to the International Emergency Food Reserve and extrabudgetary contributions.

g/ I.e., the imputed share of regular budget financing of technical cooperation expenditures in relation to the distribution of assessments among Member States.

Table A-2. Contributions for operational activities of the United Nations system, by donor, 2003
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP		UNDP admin. funds		UNFPA		UNICEF		WFP		TOTAL UN funds
	Core (1)	Other res. (2)	CORE (3)	Other res. (4)	CORE (5)	Other res. (6)	CORE (7)	Other res. (8)	CORE (9)	Other res. (10)	(1-10) (11)
Member States											
Afghanistan	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Albania	0	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Algeria	100	45	0	0	11	0	20	0	9 966	0	10 162
Andorra	16	0	15	0	12	0	169	257	67	0	536
Angola	2	5	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	10
Antigua and Barbuda	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Argentina	65	161 188	0	0	0	0	75	1 210	0	0	162 538
Armenia	0	25	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	33
Australia	4 667	14 896	213	9	1 377	85	4 087	27 461	35 650	846	89 293
Austria	5 380	169	160	0	370	542	3 406	716	2 193	0	12 956
Azerbaijan	0	1 956	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 957
Bahamas	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	6
Bahrain	56	1 155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1 211
Bangladesh	400	0	0	0	28	0	0	1	0	0	429
Barbados	0	12	1	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	21
Belarus	0	206	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	206
Belgium	12 941	5 912	895	5 336	4 178	3 247	8 533	8 831	10 622	0	60 495
Belize	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	50
Benin	0	- 364	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	- 361
Bhutan	26	33	0	0	6	0	15	0	0	0	80
Bolivia	0	41 635	0	0	4	0	5	441	0	0	42 085
Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	2 309	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 309
Botswana	- 7	2 773	6	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	2 776
Brazil	200	96 872	0	87	0	70	1 482	1 482	0	0	100 193
Brunei Darussalam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bulgaria	0	27 033	0	0	11	0	- 36	0	0	0	27 008
Burkina Faso	0	146	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	148
Burundi	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Cambodia	0	11	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	14

Table A-2. (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP		UNDP admin. funds		UNFPA		UNICEF		WFP		TOTAL UN funds
	Core (1)	Other res. (2)	CORE (3)	Other res. (4)	CORE (5)	Other res. (6)	CORE (7)	Other res. (8)	CORE (9)	Other res. (10)	(1-10) (11)
Member States											
Cameroon	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	33	70	117
Canada	38 846	29 579	1 575	415	9 027	3 170	17 144	78 026	101 290	- 170	278 902
Cape Verde	0	0	0	0	7	0	2	0	0	0	9
Central African Rep.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chile	50	23 183	0	0	5	0	112	217	0	0	23 567
China	3 150	29 550	90	24	820	0	1 250	316	1 250	46	36 496
Colombia	- 378	154 194	0	0	0	948	223	894	0	0	155 881
Comoros	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Congo	0	242	0	0	8	9	0	0	0	0	259
Costa Rica	217	467	3	0	6	0	9	0	0	0	702
Côte d'Ivoire	0	547	0	0	23	0	76	0	0	0	646
Croatia	0	0	0	0	1	0	224	63	0	0	288
Cuba	1 353	116	0	0	5	0	10	0	470	45	1 999
Cyprus	9	3	6	0	2	0	427	0	95	0	542
Czech Republic	320	398	61	0	94	0	459	88	178	0	1 598
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	0	1 107	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1 109
Denmark	55 273	13 659	4 504	627	25 396	1 490	30 079	10 431	40 294	-1 472	180 281
Djibouti	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	7
Dominica	0	- 19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	- 19
Dominican Republic	0	3 807	0	0	0	13	41	113	47	0	4 021
Ecuador	0	17 814	0	0	0	0	136	313	0	182	18 445
Egypt	668	12 249	0	0	72	724	0	0	359	187	14 259
El Salvador	0	27 533	0	0	1	0	26	0	0	0	27 560
Equatorial Guinea	- 11	420	0	0	178	0	0	0	0	0	587
Eritrea	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	47	0	48
Estonia	26	22	0	0	2	0	42	0	0	0	94
Ethiopia	158	339	0	0	4	0	50	0	0	0	551
Fed. States of Micronesia	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3

Table A-2. (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP		UNDP admin. funds		UNFPA		UNICEF		WFP		TOTAL UN funds
	Core (1)	Other res. (2)	CORE (3)	Other res. (4)	CORE (5)	Other res. (6)	CORE (7)	Other res. (8)	CORE (9)	Other res. (10)	(1-10) (11)
Member States											
Fiji	0	- 28	0	24	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Finland	14 532	4 060	595	568	13 940	2 366	17 750	6 114	17 680	0	77 625
France	16 263	3 116	1 620	162	1 437	0	37 014	13 020	14 940	1 418	91 210
Gabon	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	3	0	0	13
Gambia	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Georgia	0	1 361	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 362
Germany	26 285	12 657	2 976	261	16 038	1 982	56 282	35 627	46 761	42	200 911
Ghana	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
Greece	655	0	8	0	6	0	11 747	766	200	0	13 382
Grenada	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Guatemala	0	27 301	0	0	2	6 761	0	0	0	161	34 225
Guinea	0	- 10	0	- 60	0	0	0	0	0	0	- 70
Guinea-Bissau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guyana	0	102	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	105
Haiti	0	133	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	138
Honduras	0	92 476	0	0	4	0	24	185	3 708	305	96 702
Hungary	0	0	0	0	25	0	488	70	0	0	583
Iceland	0	0	34	82	13	0	166	0	237	0	532
India	4 533	600	15	0	195	0	0	0	4 153	62	9 558
Indonesia	- 243	36	0	0	33	0	237	329	20	0	412
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0	143	0	0	25	0	233	0	0	0	401
Iraq	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ireland	13 967	3 570	1 476	103	2 727	0	9 697	10 624	10 128	0	52 292
Israel	0	50	5	20	25	0	139	0	6	0	245
Italy	16 269	28 472	2 524	1 593	2 629	43	51 366	31 803	42 271	- 468	176 502
Jamaica	0	57	0	0	0	197	0	0	0	0	254
Japan	86 770	87 203	1 644	2 753	39 517	1 000	122 581	23 400	128 304	2 809	495 981
Jordan	270	2 302	0	0	50	0	14	0	42	47	2 725
Kazakhstan	0	- 132	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	- 122
Kenya	0	13	0	0	5	0	- 2	0	2 778	0	2 794

Table A-2. (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP		UNDP admin. funds		UNFPA		UNICEF		WFP		TOTAL UN funds
	Core (1)	Other res. (2)	CORE (3)	Other res. (4)	CORE (5)	Other res. (6)	CORE (7)	Other res. (8)	CORE (9)	Other res. (10)	(1-10) (11)
Member States											
Kiribati	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Kuwait	0	8 169	0	0	20	0	0	0	1 000	0	9 189
Kyrgyzstan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lao People's Dem. Republic	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	0	0	0	7
Latvia	8	310	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	322
Lebanon	0	8 606	0	0	2	133	56	- 6	0	0	8 792
Lesotho	0	383	0	0	2	0	4	0	0	0	389
Liberia	0	300	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	303
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0	2 393	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 393
Liechtenstein	11	0	6	0	8	0	8	2	0	0	35
Lithuania	0	120	0	0	0	0	12	32	0	0	164
Luxembourg	1 000	1 163	697	653	783	1 507	1 807	1 654	3 807	- 137	12 934
Madagascar	0	17	0	0	2	0	0	161	0	3	183
Malawi	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1 132	0	1 135
Malaysia	385	1 019	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	1 424
Maldives	10	76	3	0	3	0	8	0	0	0	102
Mali	0	1 241	0	0	6	0	17	0	0	0	1 264
Malta	25	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	30
Marshall Islands	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Mauritania	0	340	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	342
Mauritius	30	0	0	0	4	0	9	0	0	0	43
Mexico	0	16 951	0	27	49	844	98	1 021	0	0	18 988
Monaco	10	142	0	0	0	0	84	0	20	0	256
Mongolia	13	300	0	0	4	16	11	0	0	0	344
Morocco	163	4 232	0	0	195	307	145	27	223	139	5 431
Mozambique	0	200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
Myanmar	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Namibia	0	733	0	0	1	0	1	97	0	0	832
Nauru	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Nepal	0	8	0	0	5	0	0	0	101	0	114

Table A-2. (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP		UNDP admin. funds		UNFPA		UNICEF		WFP		TOTAL UN funds
	Core (1)	Other res. (2)	CORE (3)	Other res. (4)	CORE (5)	Other res. (6)	CORE (7)	Other res. (8)	CORE (9)	Other res. (10)	(1-10) (11)
Member States											
Netherlands	85 879	45 951	11 477	1 959	87 581	2 895	71 806	47 401	47 192	0	382 141
New Zealand	3 432	3 498	437	448	1 003	424	1 911	3 119	2 320	0	16 592
Nicaragua	10	6 166	0	0	5	0	5	3	0	19	6 208
Niger	- 10	17	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	12
Nigeria	0	1 390	0	0	20	0	208	75	0	0	1 693
Norway	91 639	57 972	6 849	2 233	32 951	5 852	47 271	67 498	49 307	-1 947	359 625
Oman	0	0	0	0	26	170	55	127	0	0	378
Pakistan	476	959	0	0	512	7 186	36	25	0	85	9 279
Palau	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Panama	0	123 012	1	0	25	0	64	330	1	0	123 433
Papua New Guinea	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
Paraguay	0	11 975	0	0	0	46	11	11	0	0	12 043
Peru	0	101 404	0	0	0	2 613	92	0	0	300	104 409
Philippines	35	2 157	5	0	27	0	145	507	0	0	2 876
Poland	0	340	0	0	0	0	153	- 105	0	0	388
Portugal	1 600	1 190	0	0	40	0	4 763	565	447	0	8 605
Qatar	0	0	0	140	0	0	10	0	302	0	452
Rep. of Korea	1 000	2 020	40	15	130	0	8 179	6 163	17 010	0	34 557
Rep. of Moldova	0	199	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199
Romania	50	340	0	0	10	0	12	0	0	0	412
Russian Federation	450	8 220	0	0	150	0	500	15	11 000	0	20 335
Rwanda	0	37	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	38
Samoa	6	0	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	13
San Marino	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
Sao Tome and Principe	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Saudi Arabia	2 000	9 309	0	0	300	0	1 712	82	3 302	0	16 705
Senegal	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	0	0	0	79
Serbia and Montenegro	0	91	0	0	0	0	318	0	0	0	409
Seychelles	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Sierra Leone	0	548	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	557

Table A-2. (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP		UNDP admin. funds		UNFPA		UNICEF		WFP		TOTAL UN funds
	Core (1)	Other res. (2)	CORE (3)	Other res. (4)	CORE (5)	Other res. (6)	CORE (7)	Other res. (8)	CORE (9)	Other res. (10)	(1-10) (11)
Member States											
Singapore	300	0	40	15	0	0	97	0	0	0	452
Slovak Republic	0	2 351	0	0	5	0	128	29	697	0	3 210
Slovenia	0	384	0	0	0	0	985	280	0	0	1 649
Solomon Islands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somalia	0	2 978	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 978
South Africa	0	120	12	0	17	0	92	97	19 253	0	19 591
Spain	6 853	2 858	68	0	633	0	18 255	10 503	4 489	0	43 659
Sri Lanka	600	0	0	0	18	0	15	227	106	0	966
St. Kitts and Nevis	0	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
St. Lucia	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Sudan	50	50	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	130
Suriname	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Swaziland	6	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	16
Sweden	62 446	43 500	7 410	50	23 999	2 861	40 839	69 570	36 906	-1 022	288 581
Switzerland	38 516	9 160	1 133	222	9 259	360	22 182	9 848	29 337	0	120 019
Syrian Arab Republic	24	2 365	1	0	3	305	8	1	0	0	2 706
Tajikistan	0	130	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	132
Thailand	1 649	3	14	0	96	0	343	2 092	378	0	4 575
The FYR of Macedonia	0	227	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	232
Timor-Leste	0	0	0	0	1	23	0	0	0	0	24
Togo	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Tonga	- 3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	- 2
Trinidad and Tobago	0	2 828	0	0	5	0	4	0	0	0	2 837
Tunisia	133	136	0	0	21	0	165	22	0	0	477
Turkey	0	2 293	5	0	108	0	530	425	0	0	3 361
Turkmenistan	2	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Tuvalu	- 15	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	- 12
Uganda	0	32	0	0	10	0	0	0	536	0	578
Ukraine	0	865	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	865

Table A-2. (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP		UNDP admin. funds		UNFPA		UNICEF		WFP		TOTAL UN funds
	Core (1)	Other res. (2)	CORE (3)	Other res. (4)	CORE (5)	Other res. (6)	CORE (7)	Other res. (8)	CORE (9)	Other res. (10)	(1-10) (11)
Member States											
United Arab Emirates	0	5 526	0	0	5	0	200	0	0	0	5 731
United Kingdom	60 448	87 874	4 747	2 876	30 221	10 084	32 528	118 270	135 868	-2 341	480 575
United Rep. of Tanzania	- 6	0	10	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	9
United States	103 724	80 559	1 617	815	0	0	129 288	193 734	1 591 264	39 559	2 140 560
Uruguay	0	7 722	0	0	0	270	50	66	0	0	8 108
Uzbekistan	0	1 015	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1 016
Vanuatu	0	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	16
Venezuela	0	15 969	0	0	5	0	111	144	206	0	16 455
Viet Nam	29	0	1	0	4	0	0	27	3	0	64
Yemen	39	406	6	0	10	196	0	0	0	0	657
Zambia	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
Zimbabwe	0	42	0	0	0	42	0	0	0	0	84
Total Member States	768 862	1 627 916	53 231	21 477	286 806	58 801	761 326	786 960	2 432 018	38 770	6 837 170
Non-member States or areas											
Anguilla	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aruba	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bermuda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
British Virgin Islands	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Cayman Islands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cook Islands	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
French Guiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
French Polynesia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guadeloupe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Holy See	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hong Kong, China	0	0	0	0	0	0	4 118	2 831	0	0	6 949
Macau, China	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table A-2. (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP		UNDP admin. funds		UNFPA		UNICEF		WFP		TOTAL UN funds
	Core (1)	Other res. (2)	CORE (3)	Other res. (4)	CORE (5)	Other res. (6)	CORE (7)	Other res. (8)	CORE (9)	Other res. (10)	(1-10) (11)
Non-member States or areas											
Martinique	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montserrat	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Netherlands Antilles	0	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Niue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reunion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Helena	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tokelau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turks and Caicos Islands	0	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Other	0	-1 775	0	0	0	3 945	1 247	0	37	0	3 454
Total non-members	0	-1 520	0	0	1	3 945	5 366	2 331	37	0	10 659
Total countries	769 882	1 626 386	53 231	21 477	286 806	62 746	766 886	769 781	2 432 066	38 770	6 847 829
European Union	0	96 667	0	812	0	16 962	0	40 550	211 166	537	366 714
Intergovt.	0	269 869	0	1 133	0	0	0	11 164	16 207	0	300 373
Non-govt.	0	19 672	0	548	1 911	0	0	6 236	7 561	0	35 918
GCO cost operations	0	0	0	0	0	0	-82 068	0	0	0	-82 068
Total, intergovt./ non-govt. org.	0	386 208	0	2 493	1 911	16 962	-82 068	57 950	236 944	537	620 937
Not elsewhere classified	0	2 961	6	29	- 184	6 268	39 324	-7 681	122 772	-11 846	721 782
Total	769 882	2 016 555	53 237	23 999	288 533	86 976	723 941	840 050	2 791 771	27 681	8 190 558

Table A-3. Contributions for operational activities of the United Nations system, by donor, 2003
(Thousands of US dollars)

	Total UN funds A-2 (col.11) (1)	XB contrib. to spec. agencies (2)	Total (1-2) (3)	Memo item IFAD (4)	Memo item Govern. self-support. (5)
Member States					
Afghanistan	14	300	314	0	711
Albania	116	65	181	0	65
Algeria	10 162	45	10 207	195	17
Andorra	536	0	536	0	0
Angola	10	401	411	0	400
Antigua and Barbuda	1	0	1	0	0
Argentina	182 538	2 379	184 917	0	1 961
Armania	33	0	33	0	0
Australia	89 293	11 200	100 493	2 128	0
Austria	12 956	3 281	16 237	0	- 38
Azerbaijan	1 957	0	1 957	0	0
Bahamas	6	- 4	2	0	- 5
Bahrain	1 211	254	1 465	0	377
Bangladesh	429	228	657	386	0
Barbados	21	10	31	0	266
Belarus	206	1	207	0	0
Belgium	60 495	21 285	81 780	4 223	0
Belize	50	0	50	0	0
Benin	- 361	0	- 361	0	164
Bhutan	80	31	111	0	31
Bolivia	42 085	2 178	44 263	250	222
Bosnia and Herzegovina	2 309	0	2 309	0	0
Botswana	2 776	1	2 777	100	205
Brazil	100 193	112 762	212 955	4 161	111 875
Brunei Darussalam	0	0	0	0	0
Bulgaria	27 008	51	27 059	0	30
Burkina Faso	148	106	254	0	225
Burundi	6	20	26	0	479
Cambodia	14	230	244	0	230
Cameroon	117	91	208	0	667
Canada	278 902	56 017	334 919	9 179	40
Cape Verde	9	42	51	0	394
Central African Rep.	0	0	0	0	0
Chad	0	70	70	0	0
Chile	23 567	223	23 790	20	0
China	36 498	2 151	38 649	5 892	819
Colombia	155 881	841	156 722	0	831
Comoros	1	40	41	0	40
Congo	259	100	359	0	650
Costa Rica	702	59	761	0	28
Côte d'Ivoire	646	- 7	639	0	- 9
Croatia	288	52	340	0	50
Cuba	1 999	69	2 068	0	42
Cyprus	542	119	661	0	84
Czech Republic	1 598	710	2 308	0	134
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	15	588	603	100	163
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	1 109	0	1 109	0	0
Denmark	180 281	23 990	204 271	17 335	0
Djibouti	7	36	43	0	36
Dominica	- 19	0	- 19	0	0

Table A-3 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	Total UN funds A-2 (col.11) (1)	XB contrib. to spec. agencies (2)	Total (1-2) (3)	Memo Item IFAD (4)	Memo Item Govern. self-support. (5)
Member States					
Dominican Republic	4 021	257	4 278	0	455
Ecuador	18 445	1 371	19 816	150	1 373
Egypt	14 259	3 507	17 766	0	0
El Salvador	27 560	316	27 876	0	300
Equatorial Guinea	587	6	593	10	6
Eritrea	48	0	48	0	0
Estonia	94	136	230	0	136
Ethiopia	551	2 383	2 934	0	2 383
Fed. States of Micronesia	3	0	3	0	0
Fiji	0	1	1	0	0
Finland	77 625	8 387	86 012	2 157	0
France	91 210	13 344	104 554	9 560	0
Gabon	13	1	14	0	0
Gambia	2	0	2	5	0
Georgia	1 382	0	1 382	0	0
Germany	200 911	29 527	230 438	10 938	0
Ghana	13	8	21	300	6
Greece	13 382	1 624	15 006	600	724
Grenada	26	0	26	0	0
Guatemala	34 225	1 032	35 257	13	136
Guinea	- 70	74	4	0	74
Guinea-Bissau	0	0	0	0	0
Guyana	105	32	137	0	32
Haiti	138	68	206	0	268
Honduras	96 702	1 010	97 712	52	999
Hungary	583	134	717	0	0
Iceland	532	8	540	377	0
India	9 558	3 199	12 757	4 158	1 855
Indonesia	412	33	445	3 000	39
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	401	2 083	2 484	0	1 668
Iraq	0	26 705	26 705	0	0
Ireland	52 292	10 430	62 722	0	15
Israel	245	57	302	0	0
Italy	176 502	94 471	270 973	0	0
Jamaica	254	2	256	0	0
Japan	495 981	89 800	585 781	14 634	174
Jordan	2 725	1 108	3 833	0	297
Kazakhstan	- 122	4	- 118	0	0
Kenya	2 794	56	2 850	50	54
Kiribati	2	0	2	0	0
Kuwait	9 189	169	9 358	0	- 10
Kyrgyzstan	0	60	60	0	59
Lao People's Dem. Republic	7	5	12	0	0
Latvia	322	182	504	0	179
Lebanon	8 792	199	8 991	0	198
Lesotho	389	92	481	41	40
Liberia	303	0	303	0	0
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	2 393	13 209	15 602	0	4 198
Liechtenstein	35	0	35	0	0
Lithuania	164	29	193	0	28
Luxembourg	12 934	7 055	19 989	182	0
Madagascar	183	155	338	88	155

Table A-3 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	Total UN funds A-2 (col.11) (1)	XB contrib. to spec. agencies (2)	Total (1-2) (3)	Memo item IFAD (4)	Memo item Govern. self-support. (5)
Member States					
Malawi	1 135	364	1 499	0	364
Malaysia	1 424	95	1 519	0	0
Maldives	102	41	143	0	40
Mali	1 264	566	1 830	21	565
Malta	30	68	98	0	0
Marshall Islands	2	0	2	0	0
Mauritania	342	199	541	0	199
Mauritius	43	1	44	20	0
Mexico	18 988	6 817	25 805	1 500	6 720
Monaco	256	205	461	0	0
Mongolia	344	90	434	0	89
Morocco	5 431	1 784	7 215	700	1 779
Mozambique	200	3 085	3 285	113	3 085
Myanmar	2	1	3	0	0
Namibia	832	961	1 793	0	1 117
Nauru	1	0	1	0	0
Nepal	114	182	296	0	312
Netherlands	382 141	81 606	463 747	12 743	0
New Zealand	16 592	1 629	18 221	0	0
Nicaragua	6 208	121	6 329	17	120
Niger	12	20	32	0	20
Nigeria	1 693	3 020	4 713	1 740	2 956
Norway	359 625	75 031	434 656	8 196	0
Oman	378	382	760	0	530
Pakistan	9 279	249	9 528	0	750
Palau	2	0	2	0	0
Panama	123 433	2 703	126 136	0	2 686
Papua New Guinea	5	0	5	0	0
Paraguay	12 043	0	12 043	0	0
Peru	104 409	5 577	109 986	78	5 051
Philippines	2 876	389	3 265	113	363
Poland	388	793	1 181	0	285
Portugal	8 605	1 185	9 790	292	0
Qatar	452	385	837	3 254	207
Rep. of Korea	34 557	3 676	38 233	875	269
Rep. of Moldova	199	0	199	0	0
Romania	412	44	456	25	154
Russian Federation	20 335	1 378	21 713	0	3
Rwanda	38	40	78	0	40
Samoa	13	0	13	0	0
San Marino	5	0	5	0	0
Sao Tome and Principe	2	0	2	0	0
Saudi Arabia	16 705	9 747	26 452	0	9 650
Senegal	79	- 8	71	70	- 10
Serbia and Montenegro	409	0	409	0	0
Seychelles	1	0	1	0	0
Sierra Leone	557	81	638	0	80
Singapore	452	85	537	0	70
Slovak Republic	3 210	60	3 270	0	27
Slovenia	1 649	24	1 673	0	16
Solomon Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Somalia	2 978	700	3 678	0	700

Table A-3 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	Total UN funds A-2 (col.11) (1)	XB contrib. to spec. agencies (2)	Total (1-2) (3)	Memo item IFAD (4)	Memo item Govern. self-support. (5)
Member States					
South Africa	19 591	37	19 628	0	0
Spain	43 659	12 371	56 030	3 036	12
Sri Lanka	966	- 16	950	0	91
St. Kitts and Nevis	63	0	63	0	0
St. Lucia	10	76	86	0	76
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	10	0	10	0	0
Sudan	130	195	325	195	358
Suriname	0	- 21	- 21	0	- 21
Swaziland	16	0	16	56	0
Sweden	288 581	36 918	325 499	23 894	24
Switzerland	120 019	24 478	144 497	5 060	0
Syrian Arab Republic	2 705	30 172	32 877	0	30 166
Tajikistan	132	0	132	0	0
Thailand	4 575	4 339	8 914	0	4 254
The FYR of Macedonia	232	1	233	0	0
Timor-Leste	24	0	24	0	0
Togo	3	26	29	0	124
Tonga	- 2	0	- 2	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	2 837	1 478	4 315	0	1 801
Tunisia	477	103	580	0	35
Turkey	3 361	276	3 637	100	- 1
Turkmenistan	21	0	21	0	0
Tuvalu	- 12	0	- 12	0	0
Uganda	578	26	604	0	123
Ukraine	865	7	872	0	0
United Arab Emirates	5 731	372	6 103	0	300
United Kingdom	480 575	152 480	633 055	8 633	0
United Rep. of Tanzania	9	631	640	49	631
United States	2 140 560	143 725	2284 285	29 906	0
Uruguay	8 108	128	8 236	0	70
Uzbekistan	1 016	0	1 016	0	0
Vanuatu	16	7	23	0	0
Venezuela	16 456	1 432	17 887	2 736	1 414
Viet Nam	64	1 999	2 063	200	1 964
Yemen	657	59	716	0	58
Zambia	6	367	373	0	367
Zimbabwe	84	0	84	0	0
				0	
Total Member States	**6 837 170**	**1147 367**	**7 984 537**	**193 908**	**216 979**
Non-member States or areas					
Anguilla	0	0	0	0	0
Aruba	0	25	25	0	25
Bermuda	0	0	0	0	0
British Virgin Islands	10	0	10	0	0
Cayman Islands	0	0	0	0	0
Cook Islands	1	0	1	0	0
French Guiana	0	0	0	0	0
French Polynesia	0	0	0	0	0

Table A-3 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	Total UN funds A-2 (col.11) (1)	XB contrib. to spec. agencies (2)	Total (1-2) (3)	Memo item IFAD (4)	Memo item Govern. self-support. (5)
Non-member States or areas					
Guadeloupe	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Holy See	0	0	0	0	0
Hong Kong, China	6 949	18	6 967	0	0
Macau, China	0	81	81	0	68
Martinique	0	0	0	0	0
Montserrat	10	0	10	0	0
Netherlands Antilles	53	0	53	0	214
Niue	0	0	0	0	0
Reunion	0	0	0	0	0
St. Helena	0	0	0	0	0
Tokelau	0	0	0	0	0
Turks and Caicos Islands	182	0	182	0	0
Other	3 454	33 919	37 373	0	14 343
Total non-members	**10 659**	**34 043**	**44 702**	**0**	**14 650**
Total countries	**6 847 829**	**1181 410**	**8 029 239**	**193 908**	**231 629**
Assessed contrib. spec. agencies' regular budgets	0	0	518 167	0	0
European Union	366 714	0	366 714	0	0
Intergovt.	300 373	113 998	414 371	0	0
Non-govt.	35 918	169 276	205 194	0	0
GCO Cost operations	-82 068	0	-82 068	0	0
Total, intergovt./non-govt. org.	**620 937**	**283 274**	**1 422 378**	**0**	0 **0**
Not elsewhere classified	721 792	2 169	723 961	0	1 565
Total	**8 190 558**	**1 466 853**	**10 175 578**	**193 908**	**233 194**

Table A-4. Extrabudgetary contributions for operational activities of specialized and technical agencies, 2003
(Thousands of US dollars)

	WHO	FAO	UNIDO	ILO	UNESCO	ITC	IAEA	Other	Total
Australia	7 960	2 811	55	27	227	0	28	92	11 200
Austria	247	- 47	2 747	150	56	0	0	166	3 319
Belgium	5 823	9 035	- 152	2 384	3 623	0	5	546	21 264
Canada	45 279	2 726	- 8	2 439	1 442	3 783	38	318	56 017
Denmark	10 462	316	1 056	6 529	3 525	1 848	0	254	23 990
Finland	2 320	1 735	574	570	1 421	505	1	1 261	8 387
France	2 103	1 577	2 061	4 061	1 000	642	163	1 736	13 343
Germany	6 784	12 209	267	5 330	2 824	1 556	26	532	29 528
Italy	15 276	16 928	8 959	15 018	37 194	525	0	572	94 472
Japan	13 714	12 618	2 510	3 428	32 135	0	338	5 046	69 789
Netherlands	44 074	14 127	274	18 061	2 897	2 102	3	68	81 606
New Zealand	1 141	0	1	0	477	0	0	11	1 630
Norway	40 374	15 430	367	7 817	8 169	1 648	0	1 225	75 030
Sweden	13 682	10 383	1	3 609	4 656	1 809	9	2 745	36 894
Switzerland	9 065	2 100	5 061	2 306	1 627	4 073	2	223	24 477
United Kingdom	114 640	15 733	547	14 671	4 275	1 313	31	1 270	152 480
United States	79 353	5 996	0	39 913	8 567	1 033	5 345	3 518	143 725
Other countries	44 515	70 361	18 069	8 311	105 756	365	5 496	81 386	334 259
Total countries	**456 812**	**194 038**	**42 409**	**134 624**	**219 871**	**21 202**	**11 485**	**100 969**	**1181 410**
Multilateral non-United Nations system	19 224	62 800	5 218	2 842	5 332	617	53	17 911	113 997
Non-governmental organizations	150 908	0	1 861	2 995	8 750	0	1 169	3 594	169 277
Total multilateral and non-governmental organizations	170 132	62 800	7 079	5 837	14 082	617	1 222	21 505	283 274
Not elsewhere classified	0	0	2 120	0	0	0	0	49	2 169
Grand total	**626 944**	**256 838**	**51 608**	**140 461**	**233 953**	**21 819**	**12 707**	**122 523**	**1 466 853**

Table A-5. Extrabudgetary contributions for operational activities of specialized and technical agencies: overview by donor, 1999-2003 (Thousands of US dollars)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Australia	8 796	13 403	8 549	5 282	11 200
Austria	3 876	2 128	4 165	4 043	3 320
Belgium	15 263	15 623	18 732	18 660	21 265
Canada	7 296	12 458	25 028	30 379	56 017
Denmark	25 677	30 783	28 681	23 615	23 990
Finland	6 812	9 065	5 649	5 911	8 387
France	11 587	11 060	10 531	10 774	13 344
Germany	19 390	10 090	10 111	18 642	29 527
Italy	56 144	76 117	85 908	75 387	94 471
Japan	68 725	67 100	39 267	36 991	69 790
Netherlands	75 844	132 793	144 505	82 486	81 606
New Zealand	691	199	212	901	1 629
Norway	41763	44 593	50 664	63 852	75 031
Sweden	34 208	30 373	28 204	27 302	36 895
Switzerland	18 939	19 313	16 756	19 088	24 478
United Kingdom	56 786	133 658	82 781	88 198	152 480
United States of America	93 035	99 593	92 068	102 031	143 725
Other countries	199 691	233 604	283 444	260 293	334 257
Total countries	**744 523**	**941 951**	**935 257**	**873 836**	**1 181 410**
Multilateral non-United Nations system	38 031	32 858	41 389	64 687	113 998
Non-governmental organizations	162 297	182 868	182 257	87 781	169 276
Total inter/non-governmental	**200 328**	**215 726**	**223 646**	**152 468**	**283 274**
Not elsewhere classified	31 349	20 588	30 388	5 796	2 169
Grand total	**975 763**	**1 178 265**	**1 189 291**	**1 032 100**	**1 466 853**

Table A-6. Extrabudgetary contributions for operational activities of specialized and technical agencies: overview by agency, 1999-2003
(Thousands of US dollars)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
WHO	444 144	627 946	625 736	452 163	626 944
FAO	144 920	168 264	161 360	181 727	256 838
UNIDO	43 639	34 556	38 710	44 748	51 608
ILO	86 480	85 649	82 899	86 557	140 461
UNESCO	133 326	182 666	199 684	188 101	233 953
ITC	11 386	14 214	12 481	17 333	21 819
IAEA	4 254	4 946	6 616	6 473	12 709
Other	107 614	60 025	61 826	74 999	122 521
Grand total	975 763	1 178 266	1 189 282	1 032 100	1 466 853

Table B-1. Expenditures on operational activities of the United Nations system: overview, 1999-2003 (Millions of current US dollars)

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
DEVELOPMENT GRANTS					
1. Financed by UNDP a/	1 631.8	1 457.9	1 526.2	1 492.9	1 736.9
2. Financed by UNDP-administered funds	412.3	459.7	500.4	645.1	674.6
3. Financed by UNFPA	187.1	134.1	313.6	312.5	272.9
4. Financed by UNICEF	817.9	885.0	1 011.9	1 043.9	1 208.1
5. Financed by WFP b/	1 429.8	1 491.1	1 744.1	1 592.2	3 275.3
6. Financed by specialized agencies and other organizations from regular budgets c/	444.0	473.0	424.0	479.3	518.2
7. Financed by specialized agencies and other organizations from extrabudgetary sources d/	1 123.3	1 593.3	1 612.7	1 772.4	1 992.1
Grand total	**6 046.2**	**6 494.1**	**7 132.9**	**7 338.3**	**9 678.1**
CONCESSIONAL LOANS					
8. Disbursements by IFAD	321.5	283.4	297.0	272.3	288.5
MEMO ITEMS					
SUPPLEMENTARY ITEMS					
UNDP management service agreements e/	176.4	113.7	135.9	149.2	...
EXPLANATORY ITEMS					
"Self-supporting" expenditures f/	163.6	589.0	570.8	632.9	495.9

Source: See table A-1. For definition of terms, see the note on statistical information.

a/ I.e., UNDP central resources, including expenditures financed from government cost-sharing contributions.

b/ Includes extrabudgetary expenditures and WFP project expenditures for development activities and emergency operations. Of the latter, most were financed from the International Emergency Food Reserve and the remainder from WFP general resources.

c/ The major share of such expenditures is financed by WHO.

d/ I.e., from funds not elsewhere specified in the table. Starting in 1998 it includes UNEP extrabudgetary expenditures.

Also included are expenditures financed from government "self-supporting" contributions, as noted in memo items.

e/ Represents services engaged by Governments receiving loans and credits from international development banks or resources from bilateral donors. These are management services agreements signed by UNDP and carried out by UNOPS on behalf of UNDP.

f/ The amounts of recipient Governments' own resources spent, which are included above in the figures for line 7 (extrabudgetary), are here separated out for reference.

Table B-2. Expenditures on operational activities of the United Nations system, by recipient country or region, 2003 (development grants and loans from IFAD)

	UNDP	UNDP-admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	Specialized agencies		Total develop. grants	Memo item	
						Regular budgets	Extra-budgetary		IFAD	Self-support. expend.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Recipient Member States										
Afghanistan	30 001	60 945	6 015	78 292	140 750	4 093	39 274	359 371	0	4 688
Albania	4 187	3 177	335	3 134	3 013	461	2 112	16 419	5 838	601
Algeria	2 453	240	777	2 405	11 619	2 151	731	20 376	1 000	142
Andorra	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Angola	5 567	3 665	1 974	32 109	148 551	3 416	16 669	211 951	2 399	3 715
Antigua and Barbuda	22	10	0	0	0	296	0	328	0	0
Argentina	134 447	2 330	188	2 237	0	2 198	4 349	145 749	1 233	1 955
Azerbaijan	4 116	2 225	572	1 108	6 599	539	114	15 272	1 794	27
Bahamas	0	0	0	0	0	536	2	538	0	2
Bahrain	1 091	- 5	0	0	0	260	61	1 407	0	26
Bangladesh	17 415	1 124	22 313	35 650	24 434	7 536	9 391	117 884	13 123	2 298
Barbados	39	95	0	0	0	259	152	545	0	151
Belize	52	1 838	58	613	0	256	31	2 849	229	0
Benin	4 802	1 872	1 687	5 170	2 575	1 804	1 032	18 942	5 984	253
Bhutan	1 616	1 521	879	2 171	5 008	1 737	325	13 257	1 381	102
Bolivia	44 753	1 690	2 213	5 933	7 263	1 990	4 835	68 677	2 835	626
Botswana	3 560	2 290	1 731	2 247	0	1 565	766	12 159	0	574
Brazil	127 418	5 854	650	14 046	0	3 891	106 363	258 223	3 563	101 780
Brunei Darussalam	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	11	0	0
Bulgaria	23 325	724	187	0	0	1 422	270	25 929	0	72
Burkina Faso	6 591	3 773	1 715	10 129	5 054	2 937	3 186	33 385	4 440	1 013
Burundi	12 399	955	1 209	14 160	45 867	1 809	3 872	80 271	3 322	297
Cambodia	16 118	15 196	3 789	14 942	17 605	2 557	11 410	81 617	4 292	1 436
Cameroon	2 082	489	2 396	4 450	2 753	2 398	1 073	15 642	2 421	588
Cape Verde	587	625	521	1 096	2 065	1 557	400	6 852	706	189
Central African Republic	2 964	- 258	2 148	2 991	2 995	2 088	456	13 384	0	23
Chad	6 696	1 058	1 884	6 722	6 020	2 249	925	25 555	965	419
Chile	24 406	2 454	91	871	0	1 693	1 184	30 709	0	246
China	40 151	19 832	4 867	17 425	12 270	6 799	17 650	118 994	9 752	2 179
Colombia	145 679	1 806	416	4 158	2 163	2 065	3 355	159 642	971	1 073
Comoros	569	1 431	907	911	0	1 696	186	5 700	506	51

Table B-2 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP	UNDP-admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	Specialized agencies		Total develop. grants	Memo item	
						Regular budgets	Extra-budgetary		IFAD	Self-support. expend.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Recipient Member States										
Congo	2 529	2 158	657	3 494	5 013	2 254	1 522	17 626	0	881
Costa Rica	1 548	1 218	311	663	0	1 270	813	5 824	823	49
Côte d'Ivoire	4 858	994	1 067	7 904	17 954	1 931	1 553	38 281	909	304
Cuba	7 003	3 918	507	1 468	2 734	1 896	630	18 157	0	8
Cyprus	9 153	4 609	0	0	0	167	12	13 942	0	6
Czech Republic	208	364	0	0	0	756	168	1 496	0	10
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea	1 797	461	595	7 476	102 299	1 841	6 809	121 278	3 847	945
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	11 927	887	3 187	36 354	65 205	3 174	20 455	141 189	0	6 413
Djibouti	332	431	347	810	4 002	1 591	582	8 094	0	131
Dominica	61	193	0	0	0	221	62	538	166	3
Dominican Republic	4 183	954	573	2 499	523	985	1 042	10 759	3 427	200
Ecuador	16 502	2 905	1 264	3 835	2 062	1 596	2 006	30 192	2 257	1 235
Egypt	15 777	3 796	1 944	12 988	4 351	3 324	3 900	46 080	5 179	1 642
El Salvador	27 940	1 527	856	2 019	3 963	1 406	1 793	39 605	6 224	206
Equatorial Guinea	752	225	489	1 020	0	1 244	415	4 145	0	277
Eritrea	6 454	4 113	1 588	10 817	67 674	2 802	2 425	95 873	1 453	186
Ethiopia	15 163	1 496	4 541	49 546	230 416	4 302	18 027	323 511	0	4 486
Fed. States of Micronesia	7	101	19	0	0	293	7	427	0	0
Fiji	197	384	33	0	0	1 705	- 175	2 143	0	2
Gabon	402	127	198	981	1	1 420	707	3 835	0	349
Gambia	2 653	556	475	1 423	3 416	1 937	1 099	11 581	1 304	67
Ghana	6 091	678	3 981	9 562	4 292	2 541	3 294	30 439	7 774	780
Greece	0	0	0	0	0	274	670	944	0	656
Grenada	90	161	0	0	0	134	12	398	350	12
Guatemala	42 780	5 042	10 273	4 012	6 797	1 073	6 586	76 563	2 488	246
Guinea	1 212	1 058	1 033	7 566	21 467	2 310	1 337	35 984	3 309	605
Guinea-Bissau	2 977	1 767	437	2 332	4 246	2 055	126	13 943	0	15
Guyana	1 082	90	33	842	0	667	133	2 847	787	16
Haiti	6 679	1 774	1 473	3 820	8 170	1 890	1 552	25 357	667	135
Honduras	109 035	3 553	1 653	1 926	6 617	750	3 877	127 411	9 349	1 315
Hungary	173	326	0	0	0	764	259	1 522	0	40
India	22 982	4 849	6 823	95 722	3 322	10 009	33 690	177 397	13 110	14 001
Indonesia	13 362	19 260	4 476	19 580	21 759	6 779	10 951	96 167	5 467	3 721

Table B-2 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP	UNDP-admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	Specialized agencies		Total develop. grants	Memo item	
						Regular budgets	Extra-budgetary		IFAD	Self-support. expend.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Recipient Member States										
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	1 635	2 103	2 255	4 491	11 174	3 562	5 767	30 987	0	3 378
Iraq	1 787	137 378	402	92 576	1091 955	1 136	199 552	1524 785	0	15 206
Jamaica	971	301	58	1 658	0	1 474	410	4 872	0	35
Jordan	2 191	1 235	337	1 419	15 959	1 760	1 576	24 496	1 657	225
Kazakhstan	1 001	1 572	514	1 368	0	814	326	5 595	0	4
Kenya	7 330	2 453	2 175	10 620	53 541	2 700	3 062	81 881	1 117	1 285
Kiribati	30	54	0	0	0	472	55	611	0	0
Kuwait	4 992	0	0	0	0	238	106	5 336	0	86
Kyrgyzstan	2 255	1 245	603	1 176	0	668	395	6 342	836	157
Lao People's Dem. Republic	3 408	5 517	1 217	4 661	2 324	1 875	2 974	21 975	2 717	110
Lebanon	7 969	1 731	517	1 335	0	1 515	2 313	15 380	2 354	529
Lesotho	1 648	1 470	397	3 342	23 292	1 454	630	32 233	1 708	101
Liberia	1 126	306	559	10 846	47 469	1 947	777	63 029	0	353
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	2 859	11	0	0	0	627	3 628	7 128	0	3 190
Madagascar	5 976	2 048	2 133	6 401	10 467	2 266	6 687	35 978	3 421	1 828
Malawi	7 948	2 463	3 175	19 328	61 194	1 490	2 629	98 227	1 436	924
Malaysia	1 875	2 770	222	449	0	1 224	48	6 587	0	2
Maldives	962	440	279	596	0	1 636	27	3 963	0	27
Mali	6 808	6 916	1 983	8 611	6 355	3 239	1 529	35 441	6 332	483
Malta	0	83	0	0	0	227	64	374	0	0
Marshall Islands	57	33	0	0	0	385	15	490	0	0
Mauritania	4 144	207	1 435	4 698	24 681	2 247	1 366	38 778	813	777
Mauritius	289	366	66	474	0	1 183	12	2 389	799	7
Mexico	12 739	4 470	2 542	1 557	0	1 968	10 804	34 080	474	4 636
Mongolia	2 770	2 277	1 468	1 523	0	2 737	1 126	11 922	1 503	61
Morocco	4 850	1 521	2 095	2 097	391	2 953	6 690	20 598	2 237	534
Mozambique	20 696	4 433	9 044	18 340	67 055	2 883	6 810	129 261	7 012	2 189
Myanmar	9 471	1	1 732	15 167	1 969	4 681	2 143	35 183	0	796
Namibia	1 575	607	809	3 060	1 338	2 096	1 264	10 751	122	937
Nauru	0	0	0	0	0	126	16	142	0	0
Nepal	9 699	3 922	2 830	14 949	16 939	5 288	7 439	61 066	1 296	2 635
Nicaragua	10 777	1 849	2 121	3 668	7 862	1 485	1 845	29 646	1 409	244
Niger	6 453	3 797	3 105	11 589	2 590	3 247	2 102	32 893	2 216	639

Table B-2 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP	UNDP-admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	Specialized agencies		Total develop. grants	Memo item	
						Regular budgets	Extra-budgetary		IFAD	Self-support. expend.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Recipient Member States										
Nigeria	6 758	6 352	6 596	31 590	0	4 020	23 932	81 247	5 198	12 053
Oman	0	7	22	626	0	966	883	2 504	0	596
Pakistan	15 540	3 851	4 874	30 898	31 190	4 519	15 192	106 063	5 666	5 694
Palau	0	0	0	0	0	65	57	122	0	10
Panama	126 357	65	422	890	0	1 018	13 294	142 046	3 174	1 956
Papua New Guinea	835	445	409	1 539	0	1 940	241	5 410	199	103
Paraguay	15 115	1 818	668	1 146	0	669	27	19 464	566	1
Peru	98 385	3 352	1 555	4 569	3 546	2 542	9 123	123 093	3 420	7 193
Philipp'nes	5 615	3 555	3 723	6 274	0	2 691	3 785	25 643	5 461	1 468
Poland	1 080	1 823	79	0	0	406	233	3 600	0	18
Portugal	0	0	0	0	0	45	39	84	0	18
Qatar	35	0	0	0	0	146	436	619	0	41
Republic of Korea	1 109	149	0	0	0	1 686	2 424	5 368	0	397
Romania	1 710	488	481	2 989	0	950	653	7 271	1 466	63
Rwanda	6 001	11 808	1 953	5 532	17 381	2 187	1 753	46 612	4 831	572
Samoa	374	403	0	0	0	1 151	84	2 012	0	0
Sao Tome and Principe	464	291	258	669	629	1 056	219	3 586	495	23
Saudi Arabia	6 642	52	- 12	328	0	749	10 399	18 157	0	10 146
Senegal	2 981	2 626	1 673	5 555	6 828	2 659	5 477	27 798	6 990	256
Seychelles	54	22	47	0	0	1 137	165	1 425	0	- 1
Sierra Leone	5 583	2 332	1 375	11 576	27 856	2 267	3 115	54 104	0	507
Singapore	0	0	0	0	0	36	71	108	0	71
Solomon Islands	1 598	232	0	0	0	619	88	2 537	0	86
Somalia	9 937	2 555	551	24 670	9 741	3 536	6 436	57 426	0	1 417
South Africa	6 618	771	640	3 545	0	3 396	2 242	17 212	0	480
Sri Lanka	5 597	2 128	- 172	14 136	7 909	4 943	3 936	38 477	4 041	466
St. Kitts and Nevis	90	59	0	0	0	65	27	240	0	9
St. Lucia	88	31	58	0	0	91	26	294	32	26
St. Vincent & the Grenadines	22	94	0	0	0	119	15	249	0	0
Sudan	8 140	1 275	1 702	20 820	135 736	4 786	11 822	184 281	4 494	3 891
Suriname	456	390	195	0	0	822	156	1 820	0	63
Swaziland	812	715	345	3 948	10 221	1 814	613	18 468	823	192
Syrian Arab Republic	2 882	3 770	1 646	1 340	8 351	3 174	37 533	58 696	5 999	35 479

Table B-2 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP	UNDP-admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	Specialized agencies		Total develop. grants	Memo item	
						Regular budgets	Extra-budgetary		IFAD	Self-support. expend.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Recipient Member States										
Tajikistan	4 116	1 326	736	4 869	26 951	757	1 646	40 400	0	32
Thailand	716	932	638	3 417	0	5 004	1 815	12 523	0	575
The FYR of Macedonia	2 445	1 176	0	1 895	94	758	1 592	7 959	997	316
Timor-Leste	7 699	7 442	1 239	4 803	996	837	1 249	24 265	0	362
Togo	2 954	360	1 133	3 215	0	1 667	690	10 019	0	150
Tonga	20	- 1	0	0	0	822	37	878	0	0
Trinidad and Tobago	1 641	611	21	0	0	631	797	3 700	0	781
Tunisia	600	999	481	865	0	1 570	2 832	7 347	6 577	108
Turkey	3 123	1 229	935	2 586	0	856	1 024	9 753	784	105
Turkmenistan	1 031	126	479	1 385	208	96	27	3 382	0	7
Tuvalu	36	0	0	0	0	207	0	243	0	0
Uganda	6 144	4 160	6 221	16 914	88 584	4 313	3 828	130 164	4 799	1 137
United Arab Emirates	2 925	0	0	0	0	141	275	3 341	0	275
United Rep. of Tanzania	9 677	2 634	4 511	15 581	58 293	3 848	6 995	101 538	8 140	2 256
Uruguay	7 968	320	188	580	0	972	406	10 454	1 665	100
Uzbekistan	5 019	455	605	2 407	0	739	773	9 998	0	80
Vanuatu	56	8	0	0	0	985	50	1 099	0	0
Venezuela	24 498	1 143	740	1 347	0	1 840	2 249	31 816	869	1 290
Viet Nam	9 288	2 324	5 298	8 825	0	4 915	4 544	35 194	5 949	495
Yemen	6 868	1 366	2 243	5 388	9 584	3 643	1 386	30 497	4 638	489
Zambia	3 278	356	1 500	12 548	55 877	2 401	4 991	80 951	4 920	909
Zimbabwe	3 791	3 768	1 061	12 524	163 269	2 256	7 890	194 559	49	1 445
Total recipient Member States	**1 580 137**	**484 803**	**2 095 84**	**1 069 461**	**3 142 725**	**2 846 00**	**830 297**	**7 601 607**	**267 195**	**299 143**
Recipient non-member States or areas										
Anguilla	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	0	0
Aruba	116	0	0	0	0	0	19	135	0	19
Bermuda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
British Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0	77	0	77	0	0

Table B-2 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP	UNDP-admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	Specialized agencies		Total develop. grants	Memo item	
						Regular budgets	Extra-budgetary		IFAD	Self-support. expend.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Recipient Non-Member States or areas										
Cayman Islands	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0	0
Cook Islands	74	45	0	0	0	349	0	468	0	0
French Guiana	0	0	0	0	0	52	0	52	0	0
French Polynesia	0	0	0	0	0	27	0	27	0	0
Guadeloupe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	0	0
Hong Kong, China	101	0	0	0	0	1	0	102	0	0
Macau, China	0	0	0	0	0	18	83	101	0	83
Martinique	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montserrat	155	50	0	0	0	0	0	205	0	0
Nauru	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Netherlands Antilles	31	0	0	0	0	152	353	536	0	353
New Caledonia	0	0	0	0	0	10	112	121	0	112
Niue	17	39	0	0	0	58	0	114	0	0
Reunion	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	40	0	0
Saint Helena	326	0	0	0	0	56	0	382	0	0
Tokelau Islands	169	0	0	0	0	55	0	224	0	0
Turks and Caicos Islands	178	5	0	0	0	27	0	210	0	0
Total recipient non-member States or area	**1 247**	**139**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**925**	**567**	**2 877**	**0**	**567**
Total other	**54 074**	**21 996**	**3 777**	**22 849**	**40 706**	**13 472**	**47 241**	**204 114**	**21 359**	**5 318**
Total all countries	**1 638 468**	**506 938**	**213 361**	**1 092 310**	**3 183 430**	**298 997**	**878 105**	**7 808 599**	**288 554**	**305 028**
Inter-country										
Africa	20 110	20 554	7 278	12 874	2 036	46 942	150 140	259 935	0	46 462
Asia and the Pacific	8 615	11 476	5 631	6 733	10 363	29 388	54 919	127 325	0	12 849
Europe	4 568	13 205	1 838	2 882	0	21 659	45 561	89 713	0	11 071
Latin America	13 340	9 342	2 461	2 857	0	29 072	31 439	88 311	0	2 314

Table B-2 (continued)
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP	UNDP-admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	Specialized agencies		Total develop. grants	Memo item	
						Regular budgets	Extra-budgetary		IFAD	Self-support. expend.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Arab States	5 075	5 310	2 279	3 730	49 725	32 666	443 687	542 473	0	10 724
Global	36 909	33 186	36 599	45 645	0	8 999	220 963	382 301	0	104 395
Interregional	11 835	21 896	0	0	0	46 384	160 096	240 211	0	148
Total inter-country	**100 652**	**114 969**	**56 087**	**74 520**	**82 125**	215 110	**1 106 806**	**1 730 269**	**0**	**187 980**
Not elsewhere classified	853	52 718	3 438	41 211	29 764	4 060	7 196	**139 239**	0	2 868
Grand total	**1 736 963**	**674 625**	**272 885**	**1 208 041**	**3 275 319**	**518 167**	**1 992 107**	**9 678 106**	**288 554**	**496 875**

Table B-3. Expenditures on operational activities of the United Nations system, regional summary, 2003
(Thousands of US dollars)

	UNDP	UNDP-admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	Specialized agencies		Total develop. grants	Memo item	
						Regular budgets	Extra-budgetary		IFAD	Self-support.
AFRICA										
Country	285 237	104 048	93 917	496 145	1526 325	125 896	204 921	2 816 489	115 966	62 036
Regional	20 110	20 554	7 278	12 874	2 036	46 942	150 140	259 935	0	46 482
Subtotal	**285 347**	**124 602**	**101 195**	**509 019**	**1530 361**	**172 838**	**355 061**	**3 078 424**	**115 966**	**108 518**
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC										
Country	239 955	169 847	80 833	397 778	433 725	99 942	189 785	1 611 865	80 456	46 605
Regional	8 815	11 476	5 631	6 733	10 363	29 388	54 919	127 325	0	12 849
Subtotal	**248 770**	**181 323**	**86 464**	**404 511**	**444 088**	**129 330**	**244 704**	**1 739 190**	**80 456**	**59 454**
AMERICAS										
Country	993 422	52 364	29 148	64 399	51 719	39 081	178 515	1 408 647	47 020	125 966
Regional	13 340	9 342	2 461	2 657	0	29 072	31 439	88 311		2 314
Subtotal	**1 006 762**	**61 706**	**31 609**	**67 056**	**51 719**	**68 153**	**209 954**	**1 496 958**	**47 020**	**128 280**
WESTERN ASIA										
Country	57 794	194 690	8 418	114 982	1169 825	18 642	256 943	1 823 274	23 513	63 335
Regional	5 075	5 310	2 279	3 730	49 725	32 666	443 667	542 473		10 724
Subtotal	**62 869**	**200 000**	**10 697**	**118 892**	**1219 550**	**51 309**	**702 630**	**2 365 747**	**23 513**	**74 059**
EUROPE										
Country	63 351	26 216	3 111	23 854	17 392	13 274	27 214	176 414	21 579	6 020
Regional	4 568	13 205	1 636	2 882	0	21 659	45 561	89 713		11 071
Subtotal	**67 919**	**41 423**	**4 949**	**26 736**	**17 392**	**34 933**	**72 775**	**266 128**	**21 579**	**17 091**
Interregional, global, other countries and not elsewhere classified*	65 296	65 571	37 970	82 027	12 208	61 604	406 962	731 669	0	106 474
Grand total	**1 736 963**	**674 625**	**272 885**	**1 208 041**	**3 275 319**	**518 167**	**1 992 106**	**9 678 106**	**288 554**	**495 875**

* Including CIS States.

Table B-4. Expenditures on grant-financed development activites, by organization, or agency of the United Nations system and other entities, 2003
(Thousands of US dollars)

	Total	UNDP	UNDP admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	Regular budget	Extra-budgetary
UN/DESA	53 996	9 125	5 595	546	0	0	8 577	30 154
ECA	9 981	726	0	404	0	0	3 675	5 176
ECE	8 419	67	0	277	0	0	1 410	6 664
ECLAC	10 761	561	4	643	0	0	2 391	7 161
ESCAP	1 276	810	0	466	0	0	0	0
ESCWA	3 182	89	0	54	0	0	1 947	1 073
UNCHS	30 064	6 305	663	0	0	0	0	23 096
UNCTAD	22 964	2 939	0	0	0	0	1 114	18 911
UNEP	0	0	0	0	0	0	...	...
	0							
Subtotal	**140 623**	**20 623**	**6 262**	**2 390**	**0**	**0**	**19 114**	**92 234**
FAO	379 207	7 301	151	1 144	0	0	61 299	309 312
IAEA	73 193	0	4	0	0	0	66 626	6 562
ICAO	99 152	7 848	0	0	0	0	0	91 305
ILO	134 887	4 448	0	46	0	0	18 300	112 073
IMF	3 672	3 231	441	0	0	0	0	0
IMO	12 731	50	1 573	0	0	0	6 825	4 283
ITC	20 362	485	486	0	0	0	0	19 391
ITU	22 257	1 064	0	0	0	0	7 374	13 819
WHO	841 887	812	0	2 080	0	0	273 724	565 272
WIPO	30 553	0	0	0	0	0	23 910	6 643
WMO	14 593	1 341	170	0	0	0	0	13 081
WTO	1 944	1 238	0	0	0	0	0	706
WORLD BANK	1 094	408	686	0	0	0	0	0
WFP	1 208 041	0	0	0	0	1 208 041	0	0
UNDP	1 114 914	262 044	421 862	949	0	0	16 036	414 023
UNESCO	276 705	3 807	542	241	0	0	13 901	258 214
UNFPA	148 563	0	0	148 563	0	0	0	0
UNICEF	3275 546	0	0	227	3 275 319	0	0	0
UNIDO	99 952	2 514	4 107	0	0	0	9 800	83 530
UPU	2 916	1		0	0	0	1 258	1 657
Other	12 242	51	12 191	0	0	0	0	0
Government	1 669 907	1 402 272	190 129	77 506	0	0	0	0
Not elsewhere classified	93 186	17 425	36 022	39 739	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**9 678 106**	**1 738 982**	**874 626**	**272 885**	**3 275 319**	**1 208 041**	**518 167**	**1 962 107**

Table B-5. Expenditures on grant-financed development activities of the United Nations system, by sector, 2003
(Thousands of US dollars)

CEB programme classification categories	% of total	Total	UNDP	UNDP admin. funds	UNFPA	UNICEF	WFP	RB	XB
01 Political affairs	1.4	180 228	75 717	94 542	0	0	0	2 598	7 371
02 General development issues	11.0	1060 723	662 363	79 103	0	271 905	0	14 176	33 176
03 General statistics	0.1	53 159	13 677	2 563	0	34 428	0	1 437	1 054
04 Natural resources	1.3	177 136	66 996	31 723	0	0	62 040	5 434	10 941
05 Energy	0.8	159 713	21 553	126 267	0	0	0	6 160	5 733
06 Agriculture, forestry and fisheries	9.0	699 640	38 541	6 740	0	0	263 369	74 786	316 184
07 Industry	0.1	26 458	9 604	3 001	0	0	0	5 094	8 759
08 Transport	3.0	219 500	60 237	3 790	0	0	46 933	7 159	101 381
09 Communications and information	0.7	167 463	71 810	9 160	0	28 725	0	10 636	37 130
10 Trade and development	0.5	95 424	25 171	5 165	0	0	0	3 704	61 384
11 Population	4.0	274 824	954	0	272 885	0	0	227	756
12 Human settlements	2.0	203 852	24 510	10 002	0	541	144 166	0	24 433
13 Health	18.0	1 707 409	194 851	6 446	0	483 680	157 101	295 000	570 329
14 Education	6.0	610 291	60 134	2 551	0	152 643	244 564	10 352	140 047
15 Employment	0.6	151 037	86 505	21 872	0	0	0	9 834	32 826
16 Humanitarian assistance	31.0	2 936 352	46 779	45 353	0	53 343	2357 126	16 524	417 227
17 Social development	5.0	411 636	180 307	61 830	0	72 532	0	5 619	91 347
18 Culture	0.3	45 367	4 142	1 559	0	0	0	4 529	35 137
19 Science and technology	0.5	86 627	7 331	4 511	0	0	0	34 542	39 243
20 Environment	4.0	350 855	79 429	93 868	0	110 243	0	10 006	57 307
21 Unspecified	0.7	71 613	6 350	64 578	0	0	0	348	337
Total	100.0	9 678 106	1 736 963	674 628	272 885	1 208 040	3 275 319	518 169	1 992 194

Table B-6. United Nations system: expenditures on operational activities for development in the least developed countries 2001-2003, by source of funding

Source of funds	Millions of dollars			% of total allotted to least developed countries		
	2001	2002	2003	2001	2002	2003
UNDP main programmes	230.5	241.2	297.8	16	17	17
UNDP administered funds	94.6	158.0	166.5	19	25	24
UNFPA	89.2	106.7	111.1	29	35	40
UNICEF	447.4	372.6	561.8	45	38	46
Regular budget and extra-budgetary funds of agencies	261.1	297.2	337.6	13	14	17
WFP	942.2	941.1	1,481.3	54	60	45
IFAD a/	112.8	98.7	106.1	38	37	36

a/ Loan disbursements.

Table C. Total procurement, by agency, 2002-2003
(Thousands of US dollars)

Agency	2002			2003			Grand total
	Goods	Services	Total	Goods	Services	Total	
ECLAC	0.78	1.25	2.03	1.56	3.01	4.57	6.60
ESCAP	1.13	1.66	2.79	3.10	3.12	6.22	9.01
ESCWA	1.45	1.45	2.90	0.82	1.10	1.92	4.82
FAO	83.71	18.27	101.98	278.06	98.44	376.50	478.48
IAEA	54.12	16.13	70.25	53.08	15.64	68.72	138.97
ILO	7.10	39.65	46.75	2.35	19.81	22.16	68.91
IMO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ITC	0	0	0	2.64	0	2.64	2.64
ITU	0.84	3.74	4.58	1.36	12.74	14.10	18.68
UNCTAD	0.29	0.54	0.83	0.44	0.96	1.40	2.23
UNON*	16.35	46.92	63.27	18.20	19.66	38.06	101.33
UNOPS	152.35	231	383.01	93.36	53.05	146.41	529.42
UNESCO	29.95	0	29.95	25.87	0.19	26.06	56.01
UNFPA	96.47	16.39	112.86	75.84	18.92	94.76	207.62
UNICEF	540.60	0	540.60	709.31	0	709.31	1249.91
UNIDO	8.65	32.32	41.17	14.74	34.70	49.44	90.61
UPU	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0.00
WFP	399.13	438.08	837.21	729.77	328.11	1057.88	1895.09
WHO	76.71	0	76.71	117.53	0	117.53	194.24
WIPO	110.09	0	110.09	66.03	0	66.03	176.12
WMO	4.03	0.41	4.44	4.09	1.53	5.62	10.06
WTO	0.02	0.07	0.09	0	0	0.00	0.09
NEX/UNDP	191.53	436.57	628.10	304.76	305.59	610.35	1238.45
GRAND TOTAL	1 775.50	1 284.11	3 059.61	2 502.91	916.79	3 419.70	6 479.31

*Habitat and UNEP procurement of goods and services is combined.

United Nations A/59/387

General Assembly

Distr.: General
28 September 2004

Original: English

Fifty-ninth session
Agenda item 90 (b)
Operational activities for development: triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system

Triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system: conclusions and recommendations

Report of the Secretary-General*

Summary

The present report is submitted in compliance with paragraph 96 of General Assembly resolution 56/201, in which the Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit a comprehensive analysis of the implementation of that resolution, including appropriate recommendations.

The report gives a synopsis of the detailed analysis of the implementation of resolution 56/201 contained in the report of the Secretary-General on the triennial comprehensive policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system (A/59/85-E/2004/68), which focused on the assessment of the capacity of the United Nations development system to assist developing countries in pursuing poverty eradication, economic growth and sustainable development in the context of the follow-up to the United Nations Millennium Declaration (General Assembly resolution 55/2) and major United Nations conferences and summits (see Economic and Social Council resolution 2003/3, para. 37).

* The present report was submitted after the expiration of the deadlines for submission of the report to the General Assembly in order to complete the necessary consultations with the funds, programmes, specialized agencies and other entities of the United Nations system following the substantive session of the Economic and Social Council in July 2004.

04-52537 (E) 271004

The present report takes into account the views and comments of Member States at the operational activities segment of the substantive session of 2004 of the Council (see Council resolution 2004/5, para. 1), as well as additional information provided by system organizations. It is complemented by the report of the Secretary-General on the comprehensive statistical data on operational activities for development for the year 2002 (A/59/84-E/2004/53) and the preliminary statistical data for the year 2003 (A/59/386), and three conference room papers submitted to the Economic and Social Council in July 2004 (E/2004/CRP.7, 9 and 10). It takes into account the report of the Secretary-General (E/2004/60) on assessment of the value added of the joint meetings of the Executive Boards of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund, the United Nations Children's Fund and the World Food Programme (see Council resolution 2003/3, para. 28) and provides an overall analysis of progress on reform measures undertaken by the Secretary-General in 1997 (see A/51/950, Action 10) and 2002 (see A/57/387, in particular Actions 14 and 15), as regards the development cooperation of the United Nations system.

The report calls for a number of actions that aim at enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations system development cooperation, strengthening coherence within a unified, nationally-owned development framework, ensuring adequate use of all relevant capacities available in the system, placing greater emphasis on results and their evaluation, and translating internationally agreed development goals into national terms. It calls for adequate funding and further reflection on funding arrangements, and for organizational and structural changes, including strengthening of the resident coordinator system. The system's country-level presence should be responsive to national priorities and needs, ensuring comprehensive support to dimensions that are key to a sustained and sustainable development effort. Intensified field-level coordination and participation of all relevant parts of the system, including those entities that do not have country-level representation, are essential. Greater consideration should be given to the regional dimensions of the system's development cooperation and to developing national capacities, as one of its key functions. Added emphasis should be placed on gender mainstreaming.

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Overview of United Nations development cooperation issues	1–12	4
II.	Effectiveness of United Nations system development cooperation, results and evaluation	13–17	6
III.	Funding for the United Nations system's development cooperation	18–26	8
IV.	Field-level coordination and integration with national development processes	27–41	10
V.	Country-level capacity of the United Nations system	42–52	12
VI.	Regional dimensions	53–59	15
VII.	Capacity-building	60–64	16
VIII.	Gender mainstreaming in operational activities	65–68	17
IX.	Operational activities for development of the United Nations system in countries in transition from crisis to development	69–75	18

I. Overview of United Nations development cooperation issues

1. The role of the United Nations system in development cooperation is at a pivotal juncture. As the international community prepares itself for a turning point in the effort to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, the question to be addressed is whether the system is equipped and organized to play its role fully, through its operational work, in this undertaking.

2. While the strategic value of that role may be better captured by its catalytic and advocacy functions than by the scale of its activities, its credibility also depends on its relevance to country needs, which, in turn, is determined by the volume and the quality of the resources it is able to deploy to support national development strategies.

3. A key challenge at this juncture is to achieve a disciplined alignment of the system's development cooperation activities behind a well-rooted national development strategy, broadly owned at the country level and designed to realize internationally agreed goals. This implies the promotion of, and adherence to, a comprehensive, integrated and multidimensional approach to development, where economic, social, environmental and humanitarian factors, and the promotion of universally shared ethical values, such as equity, justice, participatory development, respect for human rights and attention to the most vulnerable social groups are pursued as integral components of United Nations system efforts aimed at building stable, peaceful and sustainable conditions for economic progress and social development.

4. Overall, the deliberations of the Economic and Social Council in July 2004 indicated a broad recognition and appreciation of the significant progress that the system has made in implementing reforms and of their contribution to enhancing United Nations system coordination, coherence and effectiveness in supporting national development efforts, within the overall framework of the Millennium Declaration (General Assembly resolution 55/2) and the Millennium Development Goals, as well as the development goals agreed at relevant global conferences, summits and international conventions. Efforts to align analytical and planning tools with national and international priorities, advance simplification and harmonization, introduce results-based planning, strengthen the resident coordinator system and develop robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are beginning to bear fruit in making the system more effective and results-oriented.

5. At the same time, there was a clear sense that this effort had not, as yet, drawn as fully as desired on the system as a whole, particularly agencies, programmes, regional commissions and other United Nations entities without field presence. The system moves at varying speeds in participating in, and contributing to, a coordinated country-level response to country needs. There was also an equally strong sense that much remains to be done to further shift the focus on reforms from process to results.

6. Key issues highlighted by the Council included: (a) the impact of the field-level capacity of both the United Nations system and its national counterparts on the effectiveness of United Nations system development cooperation; (b) the financial structure underpinning United Nations system operational activities for development; (c) its implication for United Nations system performance; (d) new funding trends and the proliferation of global funds and their implications for the

system; (e) system governance at the country and global levels; (f) policy coherence, coordination, coherence and complementarity of analytical frameworks, such as the common country assessment, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and poverty reduction strategies; (g) the need for a unified development framework; and (h) national ownership and leadership of the development process.

7. The internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, were seen to provide a common and unifying framework for bringing about a qualitative shift in the coordination effort, from improving processes to producing measurable results. The United Nations was perceived as being uniquely positioned to help developing countries meet this challenge by integrating the Millennium Development Goals into their own legislation, priorities and targets. For this potential to be fully realized, however, renewed effort is needed to align the United Nations system's own planning to national priorities and goals and to assist countries in providing leadership in the pursuit of their own development goals. Fundamental targets that should be pursued are achieving adequacy in the system's country-level governance, including more flexible country-level structures, innovative and flexible funding and support mechanisms, and a system of incentives and rewards for coordination and cooperation. There is a need to reconsider the coherence of policy guidance provided by governance structures at the global level, including the roles of, and linkages between, the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Executive Boards and their joint meetings, and the governing bodies of the specialized agencies.

8. Finally, a fresh and far-reaching reflection was urged on: (a) funding arrangements and alternative financing modalities; (b) adequacy, stability and predictability of the volume and the quality of financial resources for United Nations activities; and (c) achieving a more balanced ratio of core and non-core funding, with a view to ensuring a critical, assured mass of non-earmarked resources that would enable the system to provide credible and sustained support to countries for nationally owned Millennium Development Goals strategies over the long term.

9. For United Nations system development cooperation to be effective, financing for it must be adequate, predictable and stable (see sect. III below), and the system's country-level support must be conceived within a unified framework, in keeping with the Millennium Declaration and the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed goals. It should also be fully integrated and harmonized with national development strategies, so that activities, country-level presence, structures, modalities and programming instruments are fully responsive to national priorities (see sects. IV and V and related recommendations). Such a unified framework would be particularly relevant to transition situations, in which the system's humanitarian work, peace-building activities and long-term development support are complementary (see sect. IX).

10. To effectively relate system development cooperation to national development processes, its interventions should address comprehensively core development goals at the country level and focus on strengthening national capacities in key development functions (see sect. VII), including through gender mainstreaming in system operations (see sect. VIII). Achievement of concrete results should be systematically monitored and evaluated (see sect. II).

11. Maximizing the participation of all relevant parts of the system is essential to enhance system effectiveness and responsiveness to national needs, and it requires the contribution of specialized agencies and other United Nations entities, programmes and regional commissions that do not have country-level representation. Ways should be found to bring into play in a more coherent and comprehensive way the capacities of the entire United Nations system in support of national development (see sects. IV and V below).

12. The recommendations that follow, whether related to specific processes, such as common country assessments and UNDAF, evaluation of United Nations system effectiveness, and harmonization and simplification, or other key dimensions, such as focus on results, gender, national capacities, transition situations and regional dimensions, are designed to promote these outcomes.

II. Effectiveness of United Nations system development cooperation, results and evaluation

13. The assessments for the triennial comprehensive policy review and the Economic and Social Council deliberations have confirmed and have further clarified the unique contribution United Nations system development cooperation can make in helping translate into national terms the global development agenda and the unique assets the system brings to the discharge of this function. There is widespread recognition that the potential contribution of the United Nations system as a source of universal, neutral and grant-based multilateral development assistance and advice, and as a trusted partner in consensus-building among national stakeholders and with other development actors, remains irreplaceable and crucial to engendering sustainable progress. The broad scope of United Nations system multilateral assistance, encompassing economic, social, environmental and humanitarian factors, and inspired by universally shared ethical values, such as equity, justice, participatory development, respect for human rights (see A/57/387, Action 2) and attention to the most vulnerable social groups, continues to be valued as a key component of its unique contribution to development. The United Nations system is also seen to play a crucial role in promoting an integrated and people-centred approach to peace and development.

14. Many countries, particularly in Africa and the least developed countries, face major challenges in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Expectations about the quantity and the quality of support from United Nations organizations in translating these goals and the vision of the Millennium Declaration into national terms are not being fully met. In spite of all of the assets of the system, its assistance to developing countries is not yet equal to their needs, is not as coherent and comprehensive as it could be and is not wholly aligned with country strategies. Moreover, not all of the system's available capacities are fully utilized, and linkages among interventions relating to the various dimensions of development and between peace and development are not fully articulated operationally.

15. The assessments for this triennial comprehensive policy review and the Economic and Social Council debate in July 2004 have highlighted and welcomed the new focus of international development cooperation on implementation and results, linking effectiveness with the extensive use of results-based management approaches in strategic programming. Efforts to translate the Millennium

Development Goals and other internationally agreed goals into a country-level reality require the strong commitment of the members of the resident coordinator system, to reorient country operations towards a results-based approach in development terms, which includes more intensive use of lessons learned, as possible, through a common system-wide framework that links United Nations development assistance to national objectives, strategies and expected results.

16. The recent introduction of the UNDAF results matrix and the intensification of joint monitoring and evaluation initiatives should facilitate progress towards applying the results-based approach at the system-wide level. Issues such as attribution of results, definition of performance incentives, harmonization of results-based approaches among different organizations of the system and adequacy of databases for a more systematic system-wide use of this approach will require further work, analysis and experimentation, including efforts to promote national evaluation capacities and further use of lessons learned from past United Nations activities.

Recommendations

17. **The General Assembly may wish to:**

(a) Call upon the United Nations system to further strengthen the support it provides to developing countries in meeting internationally agreed development goals, including the Millennium Development Goals, on the basis of a coherent system-wide country-level approach responsive to national priorities and aligned with national strategies, including poverty reduction and sector-wide strategies, where available;

(b) Request the United Nations system to ensure that the contribution of all relevant capacities to a coherent system-wide approach, at the country level, is based on a clear articulation of the links between the economic, social and environmental dimensions of development, and between peace-building, conflict prevention and development, and is geared to support efforts in countries in formulating and implementing integrated development strategies;

(c) Underscore that the effectiveness of the United Nations system's operational activities will ultimately be assessed against development results, and request the Secretary-General to continue to assess the effectiveness of the United Nations system's operational activities for development, including in particular assessing the effective use of all capacities available within the system to provide a comprehensive and flexible response to the demand of developing countries for development support, and to report on the results in the context of the next triennial policy review at its sixty-second session;

(d) Request the organizations of the United Nations system to:

(i) Accord high priority to the effective translation of Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed goals into concrete system-wide development results at the country-level, identifying the expected contribution to progress, reflecting performance accountability as assessed through the appraisal and the evaluation systems of United Nations organizations and making further progress in the implementation of the approaches set out in the relevant UNDAF guidelines;

(ii) Strengthen the evaluation function across the system;

(iii) Promote the systematic use and integration of adequate monitoring and evaluation elements into the United Nations system's operational programmes, including, where appropriate, joint impartial and independent evaluations;

(iv) Involve closely national authorities and civil society in monitoring and evaluating activities to achieve a comprehensive and participatory approach, and systematically apply lessons learned to programming processes.

III. Funding for the United Nations system's development cooperation

18. If the system is to meet international expectations regarding its role in assisting countries to operationalize and implement the Millennium Development Goals within coherent national development strategies, a critical mass of resources should be secured. Moreover, the system is increasingly being called upon to support countries in highly sensitive and complex areas, such as peace-building and conflict prevention, with integrated system-wide responses that place an additional burden on its resources. These demands should not be met at the expense of development cooperation activities. Also, adequate investment in development interventions can prevent huge expenses for peacekeeping operations in the future.

19. The analysis for the triennial comprehensive policy review and the Economic and Social Council debate have reinforced the argument that, if the expected results are to be achieved, reforms at the country level must be accompanied by a substantial and sustained increase of non-earmarked (i.e., core or regular) funding for United Nations system development cooperation. A significantly higher level of effectiveness in delivery and results requires, as a key condition, adequacy, predictability and long-term stability of funding for operational activities for development, with an emphasis on regular/core funding.

20. There is increasing acknowledgement that a key condition for progress is for donor countries and the international community to adopt a more comprehensive and integrated approach to international cooperation funding, ensuring that the financing of the United Nations system's development cooperation is no longer considered independently from international development cooperation and that it is an integral part of it, in particular of multilateral cooperation financing. More comprehensive and comparative information on United Nations development cooperation and other forms of multilateral development cooperation in the context of overall funding of international development cooperation needs to be assembled.

21. As part of this effort, the objective of diversifying and broadening the donor base, including through increasing involvement of countries with emerging economies, should be actively pursued.

22. Regarding the annual United Nations Pledging Conference for Development Activities, the Secretary-General submitted alternative options to the current modality of the Conference, including a regular pledging event, in his report (A/57/332), as requested by the General Assembly in paragraph 26 of its resolution

56/201. The Assembly decided to further review this issue at the 2004 triennial comprehensive policy review.

23. The overall funding structure of United Nations system development cooperation should be reviewed in the light of the new demands being placed on it, taking into account the funding modalities adopted by each organization. There is widespread recognition that, although there are no easy solutions in this domain, a renewed and targeted dialogue among Member States to identify new avenues of collaboration and innovations in funding for United Nations development cooperation should be pursued in a spirit of partnership.

24. Early and concrete progress in this area is critical to the role that the system is expected to play to advance the Millennium Development Goals, as well as in emergency and transition situations, and requires serious consideration at the intergovernmental level. In providing oversight of United Nations system development cooperation, the operational activities segment of the Economic and Social Council could focus on concrete suggestions for actions in the context of the Monterrey commitments on multilateral cooperation funding and, in general, financing for development, giving special consideration to new funding modalities.

Recommendations

25. **The General Assembly may wish to:**

(a) **Reiterate its call on all developed countries to take concrete steps towards reaching the United Nations target of providing official development assistance at the level of 0.7 per cent of gross national product as soon as possible;**

(b) **Call upon all donor countries and countries in a position to do so, including countries with emerging economies, to substantially increase their contributions to the core/regular budgets of United Nations system organizations, wherever possible, on a multi-year basis;**

(c) **Call for further exploration of additional sources of funding for the United Nations system's development cooperation activities;**

(d) **Invite intergovernmental bodies of individual organizations of the United Nations development system to address systematically the funding of their operational activities;**

(e) **Request the Economic and Social Council to undertake a comprehensive review of major trends in and perspectives on funding for United Nations system development cooperation in the context of international development cooperation as a whole and its multilateral components.**

26. **In the same context, the Assembly may also wish to request the Council to establish an intergovernmental working group to examine, in the light of the changed development dynamics and challenges that internationally agreed goals present, ways to enhance the predictability, stability and adequacy of United Nations system funding, including through new funding mechanisms, while preserving the advantages of the current funding modalities.**

IV. Field-level coordination and integration with national development processes

27. The analysis for this triennial comprehensive policy review, including country-level assessments, and the Economic and Social Council debate confirm the importance that continues to be attached to progress in field-level coordination of United Nations development cooperation; i.e., the ability to provide coherent and well-coordinated support to country strategies.

28. Field-level coordination should not be limited to United Nations system activities, but should encompass the entire range of international assistance to a country, including activities of other multilateral institutions and bilateral donors. The United Nations development system's support to national comprehensive development strategies will produce significant results to the extent that it effectively matches national needs and priorities. Full integration of United Nations system activities with country-level efforts, under Government leadership, should be the ultimate goal of the international development community.

29. This implies that: (a) responsiveness to country needs should become a key factor in shaping United Nations system operations; (b) the capacity of the United Nations development system to deliver tangible and sustainable development results should be enhanced through the explicit inclusion of results-based management in programming those activities; and (c) active contribution to development should effectively interact and be integrated with a large variety of development efforts, both domestic and international, including those that are not aid-related or are funded with non-concessional resources.

30. Enhancing national ownership and leadership in United Nations processes such as the common country assessment and UNDAF continues to be a key objective. The need to integrate the common country assessment and UNDAF with national planning and programming processes, and ensuring their harmonization with exercises such as national poverty reduction strategies and sector-wide frameworks, where they exist, is of paramount importance. In this respect, the United Nations Development Group guidelines need to be fully operationalized.

31. The common country assessment and UNDAF have been instrumental in achieving greater country-level programmatic coherence and efficiency within the system. The evaluation of these two instruments has shown significant progress in terms of their quality and alignment with national frameworks, particularly the poverty reduction strategies in the context of achieving the Millennium Development Goals, and their impact on coherence of United Nations system development cooperation. Teamwork among the system organizations, particularly those represented at the country level, has improved as a consequence of these processes, allowing for wider involvement of national stakeholders and United Nations agencies, although participation is not even.

32. In the course of reforms, new simplification and harmonization tools have produced qualitative improvements, particularly in programming activities. Among these tools are the recently introduced UNDAF results matrix and measures to facilitate joint programming. The full potential and value added of these instruments, however, have yet to be realized.

33. The implementation of reform programmes, new system-wide instruments, guidelines adopted by the United Nations Development Group and other measures aimed at harmonizing policies and procedures and enhancing field-level programming coherence require continued efforts to ensure that the resources of United Nations organizations and national stakeholders in the area of development cooperation focus on actual implementation of development activities and on results.

34. Reform measures have not yet generated overall simplification of processes. Further progress is required to harmonize the United Nations development system's country programming, in order to reduce the transaction costs associated with more intensive coordination. At the same time, individual organizations that have adopted harmonized procedures and new common tools tend to retain their own administrative procedural requirements.

35. Although these new tools have been adopted by all the members of the United Nations Development Group, their use by different parts of the system and generally in field-level coordination mechanisms is uneven. Contributing to this situation are the various programming systems for country-level operations, the harmonized multi-year country programmes — a feature shared by the United Nations Development Group Executive Committee agencies — and the fact that a number of organizations do not have country-level representation (see sect. V).

36. Gaps in field-level coordination need to be filled by the full participation of all funds, programmes, agencies and other entities of the United Nations system, including the regional commissions, in processes that aim at intensifying field-level coordination of operational activities for development. This greater participation should be geared to providing a more comprehensive and coherent response to national needs and priorities and to bringing more fully to bear the overall capacities of the United Nations system in assisting developing countries to effectively translate internationally agreed development goals at the country level.

37. The resident coordinator system is the principal vehicle for United Nations system field-level coordination and is a key instrument for organizing a coherent response to country needs and priorities, as, in principle, it includes, in addition to the member organizations of the United Nations country team, organizations or entities with no country representation. Ongoing efforts to improve selection and enhance training and performance of individual resident coordinators have led to definite progress. There is nevertheless room for further improvement in strengthening the performance of the resident coordinator system, especially as a collegial mechanism, requiring more effective and broader participation of United Nations organizations.

38. In order to enhance its capacity to develop a coordinated and coherent response to national needs, and to provide recipient countries with more timely, flexible and relevant substantive support, the resident coordinator system should be strengthened by: (a) enhancing the leadership and the competencies of the resident coordinator; (b) providing the resident coordinator with additional resources and support; and (c) creating incentives to attract the best possible candidates system-wide for the resident coordinator position.

39. Consideration is being given within the United Nations Development Group to the feasibility of attributing additional formal authority to the resident coordinator,

to be matched with increased accountability (e.g., in the development and the implementation of the UNDAF results matrix, where the resident coordinator is expected to take direct responsibility for implementing a system-wide results-based approach through this mechanism).

Recommendations

40. **The General Assembly may wish to invite governing bodies of United Nations organizations, particularly those with country-level operations (and their respective management), to give further consideration to adopting the organizational and the structural changes required to facilitate participation of their respective organizations in field-level coordination mechanisms, their alignment with national processes and harmonization and simplification measures, with a view to further intensifying:**

(a) **Harmonization of planning and programming modalities with national priorities and alignment of country-level operations with national priorities and strategic frameworks, including poverty reduction strategies and sector-wide frameworks, under Government leadership and involving civil society and the private sector;**

(b) **Progress in such areas as decentralization, the delegation of authority, delivery and financial regulations, personnel use and allocation, the sharing of services and premises;**

(c) **Reduction of administrative and procedural efforts for United Nations system organizations and national partners by streamlining procedures, alleviating the burden of reporting and reducing transaction costs.**

41. **The General Assembly may also wish to call upon organizations of the system to deploy further efforts and resources to support the Office of the Resident Coordinator to make the resident coordinator system more effective and representative of the totality of the system's capacity.**

V. Country-level capacity of the United Nations system

42. A long-standing principle, repeatedly stressed by the General Assembly, is that the United Nations system should be responsive to national priorities, and its presence in the field should be tailored, taking into account the views of the recipient government, to the country's specific development needs.[1] One of the important elements of the triennial comprehensive policy review discussion in the Economic and Social Council was the need to reconsider how the capacities of the United Nations system are deployed and used at the country level and how the vast knowledge and expertise available in the system can be fully tapped.

43. A more comprehensive system-wide involvement in the overall effort to support developing countries should be ensured, making better use of the contribution of some specialized agencies, regional commissions and other United Nations entities with no country representation or limited country-level presence, and the organizational and the substantive specificity of each organization, to the country analysis and development cooperation strategy of the United Nations system as a whole, among other uses.

44. The system has made concerted efforts to respond to the changing needs of countries, but the effectiveness of these efforts is constrained by several institutional and organizational factors. Even in relation to organizations with country offices, pooling resources and expertise is difficult to practice due to differences in mandates, institutional structures, policies, administrative systems, programming and funding modalities, and available financial and technical resources. It is all the more complex in relation to organizations not present at the country level. Devising approaches and mechanisms to overcome existing constraints and to enable countries to draw on their capacities, which often relate to key dimensions of the development process, should be given focused attention in the period ahead, ensuring that United Nations system support to development includes all dimensions that are key to a sustained and sustainable development effort and responds to the changing demands that developing countries place on the United Nations system.

45. This requires more comprehensive common country assessments and UNDAFs, where the comparative advantage of the system as a whole and the overall development strategy of the country should be duly reflected. Although the focused approach to a few core development themes or priorities recently adopted in the common country assessment and UNDAF processes is intended to increase the effectiveness of United Nations system collective action, the strategic orientation of those themes and priorities should be aligned with, and should encompass, the broad structure of development needs and priorities. While it may not be feasible to integrate in these system-wide processes all the individual contributions of United Nations organizations to national development, especially in the case of highly specialized technical interventions that do not need to be integrated into "core" development strategies, a wider and more in-depth contribution from the United Nations system to the common country assessment and UNDAF will enhance the system capacity to support countries in addressing the complexities of the development process.

46. Constraints to providing a more adequate response from the system arise, primarily from the current state of field representation. Country-level representation by individual organizations largely responds to organization-specific considerations, rather than to system-wide assessments of the requirements of United Nations system development cooperation or of the priority requirements for development assistance of individual developing countries. The United Nations country team, for its part, is not necessarily engaged in the broader interactions that countries have with the system as a whole.

47. Not every organization can have field presence, yet such presence should reflect the substantive requirements of development cooperation. A number of organizations that have the most direct responsibility for sectors crucial to development, such as employment, economic management, rural development, human settlements and urbanization, environment and trade, do not have the mandate and resources to provide a decentralized presence based on a network of country offices.

48. Ways and means should be devised for fuller and more effective country-level use of the knowledge and the expertise available in the specialized agencies with no field presence, as well as in such entities as the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the regional commissions,[2] the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and

the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat), bolstering the system's capacity to support national efforts at comprehensive development policy formulation and implementation and avoiding the replication of similar service functions provided by several organizations in the same country.

49. Further rationalization of the system's field presence can be pursued in several ways, such as by identifying more systematically options to station substantive personnel or antennas of organizations with no field representation within country or regional offices of other organizations or within the resident coordinator office in response to specific requirements.

Recommendations

50. **The General Assembly may wish to request the organizations of the United Nations system, individually and collectively, to enhance the effectiveness of the system's presence at the country level, whether with country offices, networks of international support, including from headquarters and regional offices, or other flexible inter-agency arrangements, to ensure that the United Nations system's development support brings in all dimensions, and related factors, that are key to a sustained and sustainable development effort. The aim should be to:**

(a) **Improve and strengthen the capacity of the United Nations system to respond to country needs and priorities, in keeping with General Assembly resolutions 44/211 and 47/199;**

(b) **Ensure more effective and broader involvement of all United Nations system organizations, including non-resident agencies, programmes, regional commissions and other non-resident United Nations entities, in the resident coordinator system and system-wide activities and mechanisms at the country level;**

(c) **Intensify country-level collaboration by pooling resources and sharing capacities and skills of field offices;**

(d) **Develop system knowledge networks and communities of practice to harness more effectively expertise and knowledge available throughout the system, which remain underutilized at the country level, ensuring mutual access and referral services of all parts of the United Nations system for national authorities and their development partners.**

51. **In the same context, the Assembly may wish to invite non-resident entities of the United Nations system, including regional commissions, to enter into inter-agency partnership with other relevant United Nations organizations to ensure better integration of their potential contribution into country-level programming of operational activities so that the relevant dimensions of country-level development challenges are addressed in line with the comparative advantages and expertise of the various organizations of the system.**

52. **The General Assembly may wish to also urge the engagement of all relevant organizations of the United Nations system, including those without country representation, in wider and more substantive participation in the common country assessment and UNDAF processes, encouraging them to use**

UNDAF as the overall framework for their country programming exercises, including through appropriate knowledge networks and other relevant forms of inter-agency collaboration.

VI. Regional dimensions

53. Notwithstanding the prevailing country focus of United Nations development cooperation and the country-based character of the resident coordinator system and associated coordination tools and modalities, regional dimensions are acquiring growing importance in this context. Many development challenges can be best addressed at the regional or subregional level and/or through lessons learned at those levels. There are opportunities for multilateral activities that call for transboundary approaches or are better defined at the regional level in areas such as cross-border investment, infrastructure, transport, the effective use of energy and water sources, environmental protection, the prevention and cure of epidemics and endemic health problems, trade opportunities, labour movements, technological innovations, natural disaster mitigation and mutual solidarity in crisis situations. There are indeed several normative, analytical and technical cooperation aspects of the work of the United Nations system that can be most effectively addressed at the regional and subregional levels, where appropriate solutions to problems are more easily found and better defined.

54. Intensified regional cooperation could also open new avenues to technical cooperation among developing countries. The growing technical capacity of the United Nations system at the regional and subregional levels offers cost-effective support to development processes, including by stimulating technical cooperation among developing countries.

55. In addition to possessing a substantial pool of knowledge and technical capacity, the regional commissions play a central role in the regional implementation and follow-up to global development agendas, and facilitate intercountry exchange of experience and promote interregional cooperation.

56. Several agencies of the system (e.g. the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Labour Organization, the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Population Fund, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization and the World Food Programme) show a growing tendency to decentralize organizational structures, with intended cost savings, and to provide substantive, technical and managerial support to country-level operations from regional and subregional offices, especially in such areas as service delivery, programme support, policy advice, monitoring and evaluation. While this is a common trend, regional structures continue to be defined with different geographical coverage and regional offices have different locations.

57. In response to this trend, attention should be given to better integrating regional dimensions in the programme frameworks or individual programmes and projects supported by the United Nations system at the country level. Information on intercountry activities within the resident coordinator system is not always sufficiently developed, easily available or accessible. Effective use of intercountry and regional cooperation, and the resulting economies of scale, is still not adequate. There is a need for improved information exchange on intercountry activities within

the resident coordinator system, and improved mechanisms for accessing the technical capacities of the United Nations at the regional and subregional levels, including those available in the regional commissions.

58. The growing significance of regional and subregional dimensions of development cooperation within the United Nations system should be reflected in measures that better capture these dimensions in planning and programming instruments and strengthen inter-agency collaboration to this effect. More generally, it is important to bring greater coherence and effectiveness to the regional work of the United Nations system as a whole on development issues. To this end, more effective use should be made of the coordination mechanism established under the aegis of the regional commissions within the framework of Economic and Social Council resolution 1998/46.

Recommendation

59. **The General Assembly may wish to:**

(a) **Call upon the organizations of the system and the regional commissions to intensify their cooperation and adopt more collaborative approaches in mobilizing regional support to country-level development initiatives;**

(b) **Invite the governing bodies of the organizations of the system to give greater and more systematic consideration to the regional dimensions of development cooperation and to promote measures for more intensive inter-agency collaboration at the regional and subregional levels, including through increasing harmonization of their regional structures among themselves and with the regional commissions;**

(c) **Request the resident coordinator system and its member organizations to pay more attention to regional dimensions of operational activities for development, in close collaboration with the regional commissions and other regional entities.**

VII. Capacity-building

60. National capacity-building is a central purpose of the United Nations system's operational activities. However, assessments conducted in different parts of the system have pointed to weaknesses that continue to exist in this domain. United Nations organizations should pursue in a determined way several key actions, including: (a) further elaborating a shared understanding of the parameters and approaches to capacity development; and (b) articulating more explicitly in all programmes the operational implications of capacity-building and its sustainability as a goal of technical assistance.

61. In this context, the United Nations system should encourage initiatives that, while pursuing the enhancement of United Nations staff skills in system-wide results-based management, deliberately aim at strengthening those capacities among nationals from the recipient country, through improved training and the use of appraisal and reward systems, so that programming capacities and capacities for implementing national development policies are further enhanced. In this regard, it would be useful for the General Assembly to reiterate that the development of

national capacity is a key consideration in defining the contents and the objectives of United Nations system development cooperation, calling upon United Nations organizations to promote or follow up their review of approaches to national capacity-building with concrete initiatives.

62. The promotion of cooperation among developing countries — South-South cooperation — is an indirect but potentially very valuable contribution to the development of national capacities in developing countries, allowing for better use of their capacities beyond national borders. It should be regarded as a critical dimension of United Nations system development cooperation. Although many United Nations organizations have policies and/or programmes of support for South-South cooperation, that potential remains underutilized. The Assembly may urge United Nations organizations to promote more actively South-South cooperation.

Recommendations

63. **The General Assembly may wish to stress the importance of national capacity-building as a central goal of United Nations system development cooperation, calling upon its organizations in particular to:**

(a) **Provide further support to the efforts of developing countries to establish and/or maintain effective national planning institutions and devise national strategies for capacity-building in the pursuit of internationally agreed development goals;**

(b) **Adopt measures that ensure the sustainability of capacity-building activities, including further development of national execution modalities to maximize support for national capacity development.**

64. **The General Assembly may also wish to urge organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to mainstream, in their programmes, country-level activities and country offices, modalities to support South-South cooperation that will promote the dissemination of good practices in this field, promote indigenous knowledge, know-how and technology in the South, facilitate networking among experts and institutions in developing countries and, in general, catalyse South-South cooperation.**

VIII. Gender mainstreaming in operational activities

65. Gender equality is not only one of the Millennium Development Goals, it is also recognized as a vital means for achieving the other Millennium Development Goals. In the Economic and Social Council deliberations on the triennial comprehensive policy review, the general trend of mainstreaming gender perspectives and addressing gender issues in operational activities and in humanitarian operations was welcomed.

66. The common country assessment and UNDAF represent instruments that should play a key role in bringing forward the gender perspective into country-level programmes. The role of the gender theme groups, when they function effectively and are given adequate support, has been key to this progress. However, significant gaps remain. Progress in integrating gender perspectives in United Nations system operational activities has been mainly the result of efforts by individual staff members and experts, rather than of clearly articulated general organizational

priorities. Visible results of gender mainstreaming remain weak, as links between gender equality goals and women's empowerment and sector and programme goals and outcomes are not well established. Gender perspectives tend to be restricted to a few sectors (mainly education and health), and are weak in other sectors, such as economic development, environment and infrastructure. Inadequate sex-disaggregation of statistics remains a major challenge to conducting in-depth gender-related analytical work, including reporting on the internationally agreed goals. Analytical capacities and monitoring mechanisms within the United Nations system on gender are also inadequate.

67. Stronger commitment and accountability, both at the highest level of all United Nations system organizations and at the field level, are desirable to achieve more visible results in the areas of gender equality and the empowerment of women, and to further strengthen United Nations system capacity in mainstreaming gender in all areas of development cooperation, including in developing national capacities.

Recommendation

68. **The General Assembly may wish to:**

(a) **Call upon all organizations of the United Nations system to articulate specific goals and targets to be pursued within their organizational mandates in achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women, including gender mainstreaming in their country programmes, planning instruments and sector-wide programmes, with specific outcomes to be achieved at the country level, and to establish clear accountability measures for monitoring results;**

(b) **Urge the resident coordinator system to collaborate, working closely with relevant national counterparts and other development partners, on generating sex-disaggregated statistics in support of more in-depth analysis of gender-related issues of development, gender-responsive programming and reporting on progress in gender dimensions in the Millennium Development Goals and other internationally agreed goals;**

(c) **Call upon all organizations of the United Nations system to collaborate, through the resident coordination system, on providing and mobilizing gender specialist resources, in support of gender mainstreaming in country-level activities in all sectors where they may be required.**

IX. Operational activities for development of the United Nations system in countries in transition from crisis to development

69. Peace and security are closely intertwined with development, and the sustainability of one is linked to the other. Conflict and its aftermath present enormous impediments to human rights and sustainable development and to progress in implementing the Millennium Development Goals. Situations of transition from conflict to development present opportunities to recover lost ground, but pose complex challenges. In transitional situations, the boundaries between development cooperation, conflict prevention, humanitarian assistance and crisis management are often blurred and, therefore, a comprehensive and integrated approach is needed. It is also recognized that timely and adequate investment in

post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction has tremendous pay-offs in averting relapse into conflict.

70. The United Nations system has a vital role to play in the area of transition. It is uniquely placed to deal with the broad and complex issues of transition from relief to development, given its broad mandate encompassing peace and development, its global presence, its expertise in post-conflict situations, its ability to intervene at short notice and its international legitimacy, which is particularly important in situations where Government capacities are weak.

71. In order to better respond to increased demands, the United Nations system has taken measures to strengthen interdepartmental and inter-agency coordination to promote an integrated approach to peace-building and conflict prevention. However, this has to be further deepened through a better understanding of the country-specific character of transition issues, the identification of strategic interventions, their sequencing and consensus-building around them, leading to more coherent, coordinated and harmonized inter-agency assistance at the country level.

72. In this regard, there is a need to provide more systematic support to strengthen the capacity of the resident coordinator/humanitarian coordinator, and to improve staff skills in areas such as strategic planning, situation analysis and needs assessment, governance, human rights and humanitarian action. The United Nations Development Group/Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs Working Group on Transition Issues is actively working on measures to promote and support an integrated approach to transition issues across the system, including tools such as post-conflict needs assessments.

73. Post-conflict recovery programmes, including comprehensive demobilization, disarmament and reintegration of ex-combatants, the rehabilitation and reintegration of internally displaced populations and the rebuilding of crucial sectors, such as the judicial and security sectors, are vital to transition. Promoting national capacity-building and ownership in managing post-conflict programmes are key to their success. In most transition situations a gap exists between assessed needs, resource commitments and actual resource flows, as well as their timeliness. As such, the level and the timing of resources made available is a critical factor of success or failure. Member States need to address these issues and devise appropriate modalities for channelling adequate, predictable and timely funding, not only for humanitarian assistance but also for critical transitional activities for longer-term development needs.

74. A stronger commitment from Member States to assist countries in transition through adequate and timely support for critical interventions during transition is urgently required, with a view to sustaining their recovery and long-term development. Further improvements in mechanisms adopted by the United Nations system to support coordinated field-level operations are also necessary in transition countries to promote a comprehensive and integrated approach to post-conflict assistance for peace-building and longer term development.

Recommendation

75. **The General Assembly may wish to:**

(a) **Urge Member States to consider more coordinated and flexible approaches to funding for recovery from conflict, building on the experience of**

the use of multiple resource mobilization instruments such as the inter-agency Consolidated Appeals Process, dedicated donor conferences, the consultative group mechanism and round tables for financing unified United Nations strategic plans for transition, and taking into account other resources made available through assessed contributions to peace and security missions, stressing the need for adequacy and timeliness;

(b) Acknowledge the regional and subregional dimensions of post-conflict peace-building because of the subregional nature of most conflicts, especially in Africa;

(c) Call on the humanitarian, development and political arms of the United Nations system, both at the global and the regional levels, to take further measures to improve coordination and provide more coherent support to field-level operations, within the framework of a comprehensive and integrated approach, clarifying their respective roles, adopting common country strategies, making flexible use of common needs assessment, and programming tools and simplifying procedures for the delivery of assistance;

(d) Call upon all organizations of the United Nations system operating at the country level to promote national ownership and build national capacities for managing transition processes and implementing post-conflict recovery and long-term development programmes.

Notes

[1] See General Assembly resolution 47/199; see also General Assembly resolution 44/211 in which the Assembly emphasized that the range and quantity of skills and expertise assembled by the United Nations system at the country level, under the team leadership of the resident coordinator, should correspond to the multisectoral and sectoral technical backstopping needs and requirements of developing countries and should be within the framework of the respective government programme of cooperation of the United Nations system, rather than to the institutional structure of the United Nations system.

[2] Issues relating more particularly to the regional commissions are addressed in section VI below.